

regulate the practice of chiropractic in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3457. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Wool Handlers' Union, Local No. 16703, American Federation of Labor, of Boston, Mass., favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution 171 and Senate bill 1233; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3458. By Mr. VARE: Petition of Philadelphia Board of Trade, opposing the passage of Senate bill 4119; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3459. Also, petition of Philadelphia Board of Trade, opposing the passage of House bill 13090; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3460. Also, petition of Philadelphia Board of Trade, opposing the passage of House bill 13355; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3461. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Ernest De Nault Robertson Post, No. 14, of the American Legion, favoring the passage of legislation by Congress for a fair and equitable adjustment of compensation to the former service men and women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, May 6, 1920.

Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we bless Thee for the brightness of the morning and for all Thy continued favors. We ask for Thy guidance and help amid the problems and the discouragements of the hour. Guide us to a solution of those problems as it may be agreeable in Thy sight. Bless Thy servants to-day in all the deliberations of the hour. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when on request of Mr. CURRIS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

LOSSES TO CONTRACTORS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in further response to a resolution of June 19, 1919, certain information relative to the amount and cause of loss, if any, to contractors on contracts in the Lower St. Francis levee districts and the first and second Government districts, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 6750. An act to deport certain undesirable aliens and to deny readmission to those deported;

H. R. 8314. An act to provide for the training of officers of the Army in aeronautic engineering;

H. R. 9615. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to correct an error in an Indian allotment;

H. R. 12460. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Maine into the Union;

H. R. 12537. An act to provide for an examination and report on the condition and possible irrigation development of the Imperial Valley in California;

H. R. 12824. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Alabama into the Union;

H. R. 13139. An act for the sale of isolated tracts in the former Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, N. Dak.;

H. R. 13227. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims; and

H. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to correct an error in the wording of the appropriation of \$71,000 made in the act approved July 9, 1918, and to authorize the Secretary of War to pay said sum to respective parties entitled thereto.

REFERENDUM ON PROHIBITION IN OHIO.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have no petition to present, but I wish to make a statement that may give some information that we do not seem to get otherwise. I have seen no notice taken in any of our papers here or any of the large papers of the country as to the result of the recount being had on the

prohibition amendment referendum in Ohio. I have a statement from an Ohio paper under date of April 27 saying:

Margin eliminated in the recount of the Ohio referendum on prohibition. Drys obtained lead of 96.

On the referendum of the prohibition amendment the vote on the face of the returns showed 500 or 600 majority against the amendment. A recount was asked and is now going on under the direction of one of the State judges. The above shows that the wet majority has been wiped out and the probabilities now are that a dry majority will finally be returned.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON. I present a petition of sundry citizens of Duluth, Minn., in reference to the bill introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] yesterday regarding salmon fisheries in the Yukon River and for the protection of the Indians of Alaska. That bill was referred to the Committee on Territories, and I move that the petition be so referred.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Columbus, Kans., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 447, International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers, of Marysville, Kans., praying for the parole of Federal prisoners, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Bringhurst, Ind., remonstrating against compulsory military training and praying for the adoption of physical education in public schools and colleges of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Kay County Wheat Growers' Association, of Blackwell, Okla., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reimbursement of farmers for losses sustained by action of the Government in fixing the price of wheat, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MCLEAN presented a petition of Leonard Wood Camp, No. 1, Ex-Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines' Association, of Hartford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation granting additional bonus to ex-service men, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of the Chamber of Commerce and of the Republican Club of Waterbury, in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to insure a just and adequate wage for postal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Norwich, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit for the purpose of canning and export from Alaska fishing of salmon in the Yukon River, Alaska, its tributaries, and adjacent waters, which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Hartford, Conn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation permitting banks to charge an exchange rate of 10 cents per \$100, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a petition of Sidney V. Beach Camp, No. 10, of Branford, Conn., and a petition of the Charles L. Burdett Camp, No. 4, United Spanish War Veterans, of Hartford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to men who served in the Spanish War, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Association of Credit Men of New Haven, Conn., praying for the repeal of the excess-profits tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Wallingford, Conn., and a petition of the Cornelia Circle of Rockville, Conn., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the James Connelly Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, of Ansonia, Conn., praying for the recognition of the republic of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Pequonnock Yacht Club, of Bridgeport, Conn., praying for the repeal of the tax on yachts and pleasure boats, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

SABINE RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 13724)

to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Sabine River at or near Orange, Tex., and I submit a report (No. 577) thereon. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Orange Chamber of Commerce, its successors and assigns, be, and it hereby is, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Sabine River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the city of Orange, Tex., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RED RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 13590) granting the consent of Congress to Sid Smith, of Bonham, Tex., for the construction of a bridge across the Red River between the counties of Fannin, Tex., and Bryan, Okla., and I submit a report (No. 576) thereon. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to Sid Smith, of Bonham, Tex., and his successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Red River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, from a point on its south bank northeast of Elwood, Fannin County, Tex., to a suitable point on the north bank of Red River lying in a northerly direction from said beginning in the county of Bryan, in the State of Oklahoma, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DELAWARE RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 4212) to authorize the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey to construct a bridge across the waters of the Delaware River, between the city of Easton, in the State of Pennsylvania, and the city of Phillipsburg, in the State of New Jersey, and I submit a report (No. 578) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That authority be, and is hereby, granted to the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New Jersey, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge, and approaches thereto, across the Delaware River, between the city of Easton, in the State of Pennsylvania, and the city of Phillipsburg, in the State of New Jersey, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation and in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 4335) granting a pension to Josephine Nickerson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON:

A bill (S. 4336) to amend the interstate-commerce act as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 4337) providing for the deportation of aliens upon a second conviction for illegal traffic in narcotics; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 4338) for the retirement of Clarence Cappel; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

A bill (S. 4339) for the relief of Percy de Marets Betts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 4340) granting a pension to William G. Schwarz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCE:

A bill (S. 4341) to amend the war finance corporation act; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 4342) fixing the compensation of the United States customs guards and night inspectors; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 4343) making an appropriation for the purchase of property adjoining the Federal building at Salt Lake City, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

AMENDMENTS TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$9,819 to Katherine Macdonald, of Butte, Mont., for and on account of unpaid claims held by her on account of work and services performed on or supplies furnished for the construction of the Corbett Tunnel, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRANCE submitted an amendment relative to the use of the public highway in front of any hotel, apartment hotel, railroad terminal, restaurant, theater, or other place of public amusement in the District of Columbia, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

UNFAIR FOREIGN COMPETITION.

Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 10918) to provide revenue and encourage domestic industries by the elimination, through the assessment of special duties, on unfair foreign competition, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES.

Mr. BORAH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 357), which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, is instructed to investigate forthwith and report to the Senate as soon as possible the campaign expenditures of the various presidential candidates in both parties, the names of the persons, firms, or corporations subscribing, the amount contributed, the method of expenditure of said sums, and all facts in relation thereto, not only as to the subscriptions of money and expenditures thereof but as to the use of any other means or influence, including the promise or use of patronage and the providing of funds for setting up contesting delegations, and all other facts in relation thereto that would not only be of public interest but would aid the Congress in remedial legislation relative to this growing evil.

That said Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby empowered to sit and act at such time and place as it may deem necessary; to require by subpoena, or otherwise, the attendance of witnesses, the production of books, papers, and documents; to employ stenographers at a cost of not exceeding \$1 per printed page. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses. Subpoenas for witnesses shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee thereof. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties provided by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The expense thereof shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers ordered by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

COST OF PRODUCTION OF WHEAT IN KANSAS.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have here a statement as to the cost of the production of wheat in the State of Kansas for the year 1919. I should like to have it printed as a document, and I move that it be referred to the Committee on Printing with that view.

The motion was agreed to.

FARM-LOAN BANKS.

Mr. McLEAN. If the morning business is closed, I wish to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (S. 3897) to amend sections 16 and 26 of the act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm-loan act. The bill simply provides a method by which the joint-stock land banks may go into voluntary liquidation.

As many Senators know, when the suit was brought which attacked the act creating the Federal Farm Loan System, it suspended the operations of the joint-stock land banks, and those of them that had not reached a paying basis when the suit was brought went out of business. It seems to me that inasmuch as the Government invited them into this field Congress ought to provide some way by which they can go out without material loss.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection at all to any of the joint-stock land banks going out of business; all of them ought to

go out; but I have not had a chance to read the bill to which the Senator refers. If it simply allows the dissolution of joint-stock land banks, I have not any objection to it at all, and it ought to pass.

Mr. McLEAN. That is all it does. It proposes to retain the first section of the act as presented by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA]. The bill is approved by the Banking and Currency Committee and is unanimously favored by the Federal Farm Loan Board. It is also desired by the joint-stock land banks themselves. I hope there will be no opposition to immediate action upon the measure.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the Senator ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. McLEAN. I make that request.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment to strike out all beginning with section 2, page 2, line 21, in the following words:

SEC. 2. That section 26 of said act be amended to read as follows:
 "SEC. 26. That every Federal land bank and every national farm-loan association, including the capital and reserve or surplus therein and the income derived therefrom, shall be exempt from Federal, State, municipal, and local taxation except taxes upon real estate held, purchased, or taken by said bank or association under the provisions of section 11 and section 13 of this act. First mortgages executed to Federal land banks and farm-loan bonds issued by Federal land banks, under the provisions of this act, shall be deemed and held to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States, and as such they and the income derived therefrom shall be exempt from Federal, State, municipal, and local taxation.

"Shares in any joint-stock land bank may be included in the valuation of the personal property of the owner or holder of such shares in assessing taxes imposed by authority of the State within which the bank is located, and such assessment and taxation shall be in manner and subject to conditions and limitations contained in section 5219 of the Revised Statutes with reference to the shares of national banking associations.

"This amendment shall not apply to any farm-loan bond issued by any joint-stock land bank, or farm mortgage taken by such joint-stock land bank, prior to the taking effect of this act. Such bonds and mortgages and the income derived therefrom shall continue to be exempt from Federal, State, municipal, and local taxation: *Provided*, That as to any joint-stock land bank duly organized and doing business under this act, prior to January 1, 1920, and farm-loan bonds issued by any such joint-stock land bank, this amendment to section 26 shall not become operative until such joint-stock land bank shall have issued farm-loan bonds in amount equal to fifteen times the amount of the paid-up capital stock of such bank on January 1, 1920.

"Nothing herein shall be construed to exempt the real property of Federal land banks and national farm-loan associations from either State, county, or municipal taxes, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 16 of the act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm-loan act."

UNFAIR FOREIGN COMPETITION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? There being none, it is closed.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10918) to provide revenue and encourage domestic industries by the elimination, through the assessment of special duties, of unfair foreign competition, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah to take up House bill 10918.

Mr. THOMAS. What is the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. It is the bill known as the antidumping bill.

Mr. THOMAS. I object.

Mr. SMOOT. I have moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. KENYON. Is the motion debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not.

Mr. KENYON. I rose to make an inquiry concerning it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before 2 o'clock a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill is not debatable.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The roll will be called.

The Reading Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Borah	Gerry	Lodge	Sutherland
Calder	Gronna	McLean	Thomas
Capper	Harris	Nelson	Townsend
Chamberlain	Harrison	Nugent	Underwood
Comer	Henderson	Robinson	Walsh, Mass.
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Sheppard	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Smith, Ariz.	Warren
Dillingham	Kenyon	Smith, Ga.	
Frelinghuysen	King	Smoot	

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent due to illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. ASHURST, Mr. KENDRICK, Mr. KEYES, Mr. McNARY, Mr. PAGE, Mr. RANDELL, Mr. SMITH of Maryland, and Mr. WADSWORTH answered to their names when called.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. FERNALD, Mr. KELLOGG, Mr. ELKINS, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. KNOX, Mr. FRANCE, Mr. BALL, Mr. HARDING, Mr. BRANDEGEE, Mr. CUMMINS, Mr. COLT, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. REED, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. GAY, Mr. HALE, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. MYERS, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. STERLING, and Mr. SWANSON entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 10918, commonly known as the antidumping bill.

Mr. THOMAS. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER]. In his absence I withhold my vote, being unable to secure a transfer.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GAY. I inquire if the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] has voted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. GAY. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. BALL. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I understand that Senator has not voted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. BALL. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and vote "yea."

Mr. GAY. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] to the senior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and vote "nay."

Mr. KENDRICK (after having voted in the negative). I inquire whether the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] has voted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. KENDRICK. I withdraw my vote, having a general pair with that Senator.

Mr. COLT (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] to the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. PHIPPS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL]. When I voted I was not aware of his absence. As he is not present and I can not obtain a transfer, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. WARREN (after having voted in the affirmative). I observe that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], with whom I have a general pair, has not voted. I transfer my pair so that the Senator from North Carolina will stand paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY];

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Ball	Elkins	Kellogg	Nelson
Brandegee	Fernald	Kenyon	Page
Calder	France	Keyes	Smoot
Capper	Frelinghusen	Knox	Sterling
Colt	Gronna	Lodge	Sutherland
Cummins	Hale	McCormick	Townsend
Curtis	Harding	McLean	Warren
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	McNary	

NAYS—30.

Ashurst	Henderson	Pomerene	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Ransdell	Swanson
Comer	Jones, N. Mex.	Reed	Thomas
Culberson	King	Robinson	Underwood
Gay	McKellar	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Gerry	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh, Mont.
Harris	Nugent	Smith, Ga.	
Harrison	Pittman	Smith, Md.	

NOT VOTING—35.

Beckham	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Simmons
Borah	Kendrick	Overman	Spencer
Dial	Kirby	Owen	Stanley
Edge	La Follette	Penrose	Trammell
Fall	Lenroot	Phelan	Wadsworth
Fletcher	McCumber	Phipps	Watson
Glass	Moses	Poindexter	Williams
Gore	New	Sherman	Wolcott
Johnson, Calif.	Newberry	Shields	

So Mr. SMOOR's motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 16918) to provide revenue and encourage domestic industries by the elimination, through the assessment of special duties, of unfair foreign competition, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That when used in this act—

The word "person" shall include individuals, partnerships, corporations, and associations.

The term "purchase price" shall mean the price or amount paid or to be paid for purchased merchandise as packed ready for shipment to the United States.

The term "selling price" shall mean the price or amount paid or to be paid by the person to whom imported merchandise obtained otherwise than by purchase shall be sold in the United States, not including duties, commissions, or any expenses subsequent to shipment of the merchandise to the United States.

The term "purchased merchandise" shall apply to imported merchandise, dutiable or free, when the price or amount to be paid therefor by a person in the United States to a person in a foreign country or to his agent or representative in the United States has been fixed or agreed upon at the time of or prior to the exportation of the merchandise, whether the merchandise is shipped directly to the purchaser, or to an agent of the seller, or to the seller's branch house in the United States for delivery.

The phrase "otherwise than by purchase" shall apply to imported merchandise, dutiable or free, shipped from a foreign country to the United States without a price or consideration paid or to be paid by a person in the United States to a person in a foreign country, or to his agent or representative in the United States, having been fixed or agreed upon at the time of or prior to the exportation of the merchandise.

The term "United States" shall mean the United States and any Territory or place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, except the Philippine Islands, the islands of Guam and Tutuila, the Virgin Islands, and the Isthmian Canal Zone.

SEC. 2. That whenever the purchase price of imported merchandise, dutiable or free, of a kind or class made or produced in the United States shall be less than the actual market value thereof, as defined in section 3 of an act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913; or, if there be no such actual market value, whenever the purchase price of said merchandise shall be less than the price at the time of exportation for which such merchandise shall be sold for exportation to a country other than the United States; or in case there is neither said actual market value nor said price for exportation; or in case said value or price can not be ascertained to the satisfaction of the appraising officer, whenever the purchase price of said merchandise shall be less than the cost of production, as prescribed in paragraph L of section 3 of said act of October 3, 1913, there shall be levied, collected, and paid, in addition to the duties, if any, otherwise provided by law on such imported merchandise a special or dumping duty in the amount of the difference between the purchase price and said actual market value, or between the purchase price and said price for exportation to a country other than the United States, or between the purchase price and said cost of production, as the case may be: *Provided* That such special or dumping duty shall not apply to any advance in said actual market value or in said price for exportation, as the case may be, between the time of purchase and the time of exportation of the merchandise.

SEC. 3. That whenever the selling price of imported merchandise, dutiable or free, of a kind or class made or produced in the United States shall be less than the actual market value as defined in said section of said act of October 3, 1913, or if there be no such actual market value, whenever the selling price of said merchandise shall be less than the price at the time of exportation for which such merchandise shall be sold for exportation to a country other than the United States, or in case there is neither said actual market value nor said price for exportation, or said value or price can not be ascertained to the satisfaction of the appraising officer, whenever the selling price of

said merchandise shall be less than the cost of production, as prescribed in paragraph L of section 3 of said act of October 3, 1913, there shall be levied, collected, and paid, in addition to the duties, if any, otherwise provided by law on such imported merchandise, a special or dumping duty in the amount of the difference between the selling price and said actual market value, or between the selling price and said price for exportation to a country other than the United States, or between the selling price and said cost of production, as the case may be.

SEC. 4. That if any person selling, shipping, consigning, or manufacturing merchandise exported to the United States shall fail or refuse to submit to the inspection of a duly accredited investigating officer of the United States, when so requested to do, any or all of his books, records, or accounts pertaining to the value or classification of such merchandise, then the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby empowered and directed, while such failure or refusal continues, to refuse entry into the United States of any goods, wares, or merchandise sold, shipped, consigned, or manufactured by such person.

SEC. 5. That any person who shall, by rebate or concession, or by any other means, directly or indirectly, effect a reduction or diminution of the purchase price or of the selling price, whereby the purchase price or the selling price of imported merchandise, dutiable or free, covered by this act shall be less than the actual market value, or the price for exportation, or the cost of production, as the case may be; and any person importing said merchandise, or to whom said merchandise shall be consigned, who shall fail or refuse to submit to the inspection of a duly accredited investigating officer of the United States, when so requested to do, any or all of his books, records, or accounts pertaining to said merchandise, shall upon conviction be fined for each offense a sum not exceeding \$5,000, or be imprisoned for a time not exceeding two years, or both, in the discretion of the court.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to appear at the end of the bill which is now being considered. I ask to have it read, printed, and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment was read, ordered to lie on the table, and be printed, as follows:

Add at end of proposed amendment of the committee the following: "That there shall be levied, assessed, collected, and paid in respect of the excess over the sum of \$1,000 which any person, firm, association, or corporation shall give, advance, pay, expend, subscribe, or contribute in the aggregate during any taxable year for the purpose, directly or indirectly, of influencing the nomination or defeat of any candidate or candidates for nomination, or the election or defeat of any candidate or candidates for office, or the success or defeat of any proposition to be voted upon at any primary election or general or special election at which candidates for Members of the House of Representatives or for United States Senator or presidential electors are to be nominated or elected, a tax equal to 100 per cent of such excess, such expenditures or contributions to include all sums in any form contributed, subscribed, advanced, expended, paid, or given to or for or against such candidate, candidates, or proposition or to or for party or other political committees or campaign funds, but not to include lawful expenditures made by such candidates or regular political committees or out of such campaign funds of moneys lawfully contributed to them.

"Every person, firm, and corporation required by law to make an income-tax return shall state therein specifically each item and the date thereof of all gifts, advances, expenditures, subscriptions, payments, and contributions made, and to whom, for the purpose of influencing the result of such primary and general elections and of all taxes due thereon under the provisions of this section. And the treasurer or chairman of all State or congressional committees and of all political committees as defined in the act of Congress approved June 25, 1910, entitled 'An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected,' and of all associations or committees organized to promote or prevent or engaged in promoting or preventing the nomination or election of any candidate for Member of the House of Representatives or of the Senate of the Congress of the United States or for presidential elector or electors, shall within 30 days after the election to be held therefor file with the collector for the district where the headquarters or other office where such committee or association is located, a return stating specifically all sums of money received, from whom received, and the date thereof."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that during the day I shall offer an amendment to the pending bill. I did not know that this measure was to be called up this morning or I should have prepared an amendment expressing definitely the point in mind; but, in substance, it will provide that the dumping duty provided for in the pending bill shall not be imposed in any case unless the collector of customs for the port at which such imported merchandise is dutiable shall first find and determine from the evidence before him that the production, manufacture, sale, or distribution of such commodity within the United States is not controlled by any corporation, association, combination, trust, or conspiracy to create a monopoly in such commodity, and that such commodity is not sold in the markets of the United States at an unfair or unreasonable price, and the burden of proof to establish the foregoing shall be upon the importer, and unless the importer shall establish the same said dumping duty shall not be imposed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Republican Party, which by a strict party vote, or nearly so, has forced this bill on for consideration, is entitled to the thanks of the country for having on the eve of an election shown that while the hand is still that of Esau the voice is nevertheless the voice of Jacob.

The one thing that for years has characterized the Republican Party is its tender solicitude for big money. It still adheres to the philosophy that if you take care of big money big money will take care of the people.

We have in the United States at the present time a condition where the consumer is being plucked and robbed to a degree that requires no description by me, for the effect of that plundering is felt in every household of the land. Undoubtedly the condition is largely the result of an actual dearth of production; but growing out of that primal cause is a speculation that begins with the original producer and ends only when the product is turned over to the ultimate consumer. Enormous profits are being realized not only by the manufacturer but by every middleman of the United States. These profits can be in part measured by the huge excess-profits taxes collected by this Government, and I have no doubt that a very large percentage of excess-profits taxes that are due are never in fact returned or collected. The profits can be measured also in the rough by the advertising in the great dailies and periodicals of the country. The testimony which the Committee on Manufactures has been taking discloses the fact that these advertisements are now so excessive that they have resulted in the increase in the size of publications to a point where the print paper of this country has been exhausted and newspapers of the smaller kind are being forced out of business because they are compelled to pay as high as 16 cents a pound for white paper that a few years ago brought 2 cents or 2½ cents a pound.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. In this connection I suppose the Senator noticed in the morning press the statement that the price is to be advanced again on the 1st of July.

Mr. REED. Newspaper proprietors tell the committee that advertisements are offered to them, perfectly legitimate in their character, in such quantities that they can not print them. These advertisements are being rejected daily in order to circumscribe to some extent the consumption of white paper. This influx of advertising has grown up chiefly since the war, and it has increased notwithstanding a steady and, in many instances, a radical advance in advertising rates. The reason given is that trade is brisk, prices are high, profits are large, and therefore advertising goes on in increasing ratio.

All this I am citing—and I might hold the floor for hours bringing forward similar evidence—to show that to-day, without using the ugly term of "profiteering," profits are being made that are excessively large. It is possible to charge the prices which realize those profits because there is an actual gap between production and consumption. There are not enough goods here to supply the market, and there will be no real relief until the goods are supplied.

Mr. President, at a time like this, with these conditions confronting us, the Republican Party by a party vote forces for consideration a bill the purpose of which is to prevent the fall of prices!

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. SMOOT. A bill passed Congress just the other day allowing paper to come into the United States free of duty up to 8 cents a pound instead of 5.

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I suppose the Senator would not charge the Republican Party with being guilty of allowing that 8-cent paper to come in with a view to increasing its price?

Mr. REED. No, Mr. President. While that is aside from what I am talking about and is a detail, I will take it up and dispose of it in a few words.

Under the tremendous pressure of the newspapers that were being starved to death, a bill was passed permitting paper to come into the United States free of duty up to the value of 8 cents a pound; but the statement was made at the time that the only effect of the bill was to let in the paper which had previously come in free, that the price had gone up on paper to above 5 cents, and that the result of the tariff duty was to keep out paper which formerly had come in free. But the bill did not go far enough. The bill ought to have admitted all paper free of duty, of whatsoever price, because all paper, except some of the very highest classes used for only limited purposes, is made out of the same raw material substantially as newsprint paper, and if we would let all of it come in we would be better able to supply the demand which is now made for newsprint paper.

What has that to do with this case? This bill applies to everything. We have to-day a shortage of shoes. Men are paying \$18 and \$20 for shoes who used to get the same shoes made in the same factories for from \$5 to \$7. We have a shortage of clothing. Men are paying \$100 to \$150 for a tailor-made

suit who used to pay \$50 and \$65 for the same suit. What I have said of these two items applies everywhere.

Under such conditions what could be better for the American people than to have that sort of a market speedily broken up? What would tend more to break it up than to have the goods of foreign countries brought here and sold so that these enormous prices could no longer be extorted from our people?

In order to take care of the manufacturers of the United States, who have been making profits beyond the dreams of Croesus, you propose to shut the American citizen off from the only possible source of supply that will enable him to get decent prices. It is the old story of the Republican Party still bowing at the shrine of Mammon and still willing to rob the consumers of the United States for the benefit of a few over-rich producers.

That is all I want to say this morning. I shall have something to say later on.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I filed what is called the minority report on this bill, and, while it bears my signature and none other, I am authorized to state that it expresses the views of several of the minority members of the Finance Committee. Hence, while it is ostensibly the objection of a single member, it is actually that of several others.

I endeavored in that report to outline as concisely as possible what seemed to be the chief objectionable features of this proposal. Briefly stated, the object of the bill is to prevent the importation into the United States of goods which seemingly command a price below that which is asked or which can be obtained for the same goods in the country of exportation; and it is designed, therefore, as stated by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], to protect American manufacturers from foreign competition, upon the theory that the practice known as dumping is a species of unfair competition which may result in injury of a very serious nature to our domestic production.

It is ostensibly prompted by the enactment of a similar measure in Canada and aimed principally at manufacturers in the United States. The very fact, however, that Canada has seen fit to enact such legislation indicates that the American manufacturers have been doing to Canada, or propose to do to Canada, the very thing which the bill is designed to prevent as regards Canada and other competitive nations; and that, of course, must assume that we have been practicing, or are practicing, unfair competition against other nations, thereby provoking retaliatory legislation, of which this is a part.

But, Mr. President, I am inclined to the belief that this is one of a series of pending measures of an economic character that is designed to fasten ultimate and complete prohibition against the possibility of competition with American production.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think, in justice to those who are listening to the Senator, he ought to say that it affects no importations if the goods are sold to American merchants or importers at the same price at which similar goods are sold in any other country. It affects only those goods which are sold in this country at a lower price than that at which they are sold in other countries. In other words, I know the Senator is well aware of the practice which Germany has exercised in the past—

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; and I am also well aware of the practices we have exercised against Germany in the past.

Mr. SMOOT. I am speaking of this particular bill now.

Mr. THOMAS. So am I.

Mr. SMOOT. Wherever the goods have been sold, Mr. President, at a less price than that at which they are sold in other countries, it is generally for the purpose of unloading a surplus amount which they may have on hand at less than cost, or else to destroy an American industry, and that has generally been the case in the past. I could stand here all day and cite cases where Germany has destroyed American industries through just that very same practice.

Mr. THOMAS. I know what is the ostensible basis of the bill, and it has just been very clearly stated by the Senator from Utah. But in the administration of this bill every manufacturer or seller of American goods, apprehensive of foreign competition, will invoke and seek to apply the inhibitory clauses of the bill to all importations of goods of a similar character, thus causing an investigation, and pending the investigation, which, of course, involves a hearing, the importer, notwithstanding he does not come within the provisions of the bill at all, may be very seriously crippled, perhaps ruined, as a result of the investigation, because goods are purchased, either from domestic or from foreign manufacturers, for but one purpose, and that is for resale, and generally speaking for rapid resale.

It is the utilization of an apprehension for the purpose of placing a conditional embargo upon foreign importations, both as to their purchase and as to their sale, and both of which incidents can be invoked against the same line of goods or the same importations.

That is bad enough; but the serious and far-reaching objection to the measure is that, under the guise of preventing injury to American manufacturers, it abolishes the free list, or tends in that direction; and if that be true, then the bill should be rejected without regard to the existence of any danger which it seeks to obviate.

Now, let us see. I call attention to sections 2 and 3 of the bill, the first relating to the purchase price, the second to the selling price. Section 2 provides—

That whenever the purchase price of imported merchandise dutiable or free of a kind or class made or produced in the United States shall be less than the actual market value thereof as defined in section 3 of an act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913.

Section 3 uses the same language, reading:

That whenever the selling price of imported merchandise dutiable or free of a kind or class made or produced in the United States shall be less than the actual market value as defined in said section of said act of October 3, 1913.

Goods which have been exempted from the operation of every tariff law that Congress ever enacted, goods which have sometimes appeared upon, sometimes have been absent from, the free list, goods which the trade experiences of this country have demonstrated should remain upon the free list, become subject to the embargo proposed by the bill the instant any American manufacturer or rival dealer desires to place obstacles in the way of imported goods of the same character. The procedure through which the administration of the bill is effected provides that—

There shall be levied, collected, and paid, in addition to the duties, if any, otherwise provided by law on such imported merchandise, a special or dumping duty in the amount of the difference between the purchase price and said actual market value, or between the purchase price and said price for exportation to a country other than the United States—

And so forth. And in the other section that—

there shall be levied, collected, and paid, in addition to the duties, if any, otherwise provided by law on such imported merchandise, a special or dumping duty in the amount of the difference between the selling price and said actual market value.

The law is drawn, in other words, upon the principle that the old darkey set his coon trap, to "ketch 'em comin' an' gwine." John Smith imports a line of goods either dutiable or free. His competitor here says that the purchase price is less than the purchase price of the same goods at the original home market, but he may also say that the selling price is less than the selling price here or the selling price in the country of exportation, and he may well ask, therefore, that the duty which is levied as a penalty upon the purchase and the duty which is levied as a penalty upon the selling shall both be collected from the unfortunate individual who has the temerity to import goods into this country for the very legitimate purpose of making a profit in his business.

Mr. President, we are going mad, it seems to me, in our proposed legislation consequent upon the war, as we did in our legislation during the war.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, the Senator in referring to section 2 of the bill, which relates to the country where the goods are purchased, knows that that is the purchase price of imported merchandise, while section 3 has reference to the selling price of imported merchandise.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; and my contention is that both sections can be applied to the same importation.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought the Senator so stated. Section 3 applies to agents of importers, goods being shipped from a foreign country to an agent in New York or any other place in the United States. The goods are not sold to them at all. The goods belong to the foreign manufacturer, and they are only held here by the agent for the sale in the United States and following importation. This provision simply means that where they are imported direct the law shall apply, or where the agent in the United States sells the goods that have been sent him as agent of the foreign manufacturer, then it shall apply. It is impossible to have both sections apply to the one sale of goods.

Mr. THOMAS. I am satisfied that that is the Senator's construction of the bill, and I am satisfied that unless that were his construction he would not have reported it favorably.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course not.

Mr. THOMAS. So I am not in any way attempting to criticize the position which the Senator occupies and has occupied regarding the bill, but I have known of a great many statutes in my

time which have been enacted with a clear purpose and object in view in the administration of which great disappointments have resulted.

I was referring, when interrupted, to the tendency to enact ill-advised and ill-considered legislation in this postwar period, and in the absence very largely of adequate and satisfactory information. You will recall, sir, that during the war every bill of any consequence introduced in Congress recited in its preamble or somewhere in the body of the bill that its purpose was the more effectual and vigorous prosecution of the war.

Now, these bills of an economic character are designed upon their face, or in the discussions accompanying and following their consideration in committee, on the ground that they are necessary for safeguarding American industry against the inevitable and immediate consequences of the termination of the war.

Mr. President, the country has been flooded with literature and with assurances of other sorts of the accumulation in other great manufacturing countries of enormous quantities of merchandise designed for the American market, about to be imported, and which upon arrival will be sold at ruinous competitive prices. It is that bugaboo, that element of the distorted imagination, which lies at the basis of this bill and of the dye bill and of every one of the so-called popgun tariff bills that have been passed by the House and sent over here for consideration.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. If it will not interrupt the Senator I should like to inquire if the pending bill was submitted to the Tariff Commission for its views and recommendation?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, it was; and I have here, if the Senator desires to see it, a copy of their report.

Mr. REED. On the bill as now amended?

Mr. THOMAS. Upon the bill, not upon the bill as now amended. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that the Tariff Commission is virtually the author of the measure; that is, they drew the provisions of the bill as amended, at my request.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; they drew the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not say that the Tariff Commission suggested that this legislation should be passed.

Mr. THOMAS. No; they did not do that.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want to be misunderstood. They did not do that. I understood the Senator from Missouri to ask whether their attention had been called to the bill.

I wish to say to the Senator that at my request the bill was drawn by the Tariff Commission—that is, with the exception of a few amendments that were offered to it in committee by myself before reporting it to the Senate—but the principle of the bill and the substance of it were the result of a request made by me of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. REED. What I want to ascertain is whether the Tariff Commission sponsors this legislation.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, no; it is not permitted under the law to sponsor any legislation.

Mr. REED. Does it recommend it?

Mr. THOMAS. It is not permitted to recommend any, and has not recommended this measure. It made a report, at the request of the House committee, and that report I have just handed to the Senator.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator, and I will examine the report.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I venture the assertion, without any hesitation, that there is no surplus stock of manufactured goods anywhere in the world outside of the United States. The manufacturing countries of the world are the United States, Canada, Japan, England, France, Italy, Germany, Belgium, and probably some others. It is those nations which furnish the 1,600,000,000 human beings in the world with the manufactured necessities of life, and in every one of them the war has not only dislocated but resulted in a practical suspension of their ordinary and essential functions. This was inevitable. The machinery engaged in the manufacture of merchandise for the world in those countries, every one of which was involved in the war, was for the most part mobilized and converted into the production of munition supplies. That is true of all of them—textile manufacturers, metal manufacturers, chemical manufacturers, and production of all sorts. Even the products of the mines were diverted from their legitimate channels to those of war, and at the same time some 20,000,000 producers, the young men of all those nations, were either entirely withdrawn from the avenues of production and placed in the ranks or else they were mobilized also for the necessary production of war material of all sorts.

Moreover, the obtaining of raw materials for manufacture for commercial purposes outside of the United States was almost completely suspended, and here, after we entered the war, they were diverted for the most part into military channels. To contend, therefore, that England or France or Germany or Japan, which is a new specter upon the protectionists' horizon, is so encumbered with the good things of the world as to induce the owners of this merchandise to seek the great American market would be a hallucination, if it were not a deliberate conspiracy. What greater boon to-day could befall the people of the United States than the importation to it of millions upon millions of dollars' worth of clothing, of foodstuffs, and of all the other items that go to make up modern civilized life? What a terrible calamity it would be to the people of the United States, in other words, if foreign competition resulted in a reduction of prices to the consumers in America!

Instead of prohibiting it we should welcome it with outstretched arms, and thereby mitigate to some degree the conditions to which the Senator from Missouri has just directed the attention of the Senate. Of course, I would not, any more than any other American, care to see such a situation prolonged to the extent of menacing the existence of American industries, but these are able to take care of themselves, their statements to the contrary notwithstanding.

The business of dumping is not peculiar to Germany. During the discussions in the Senate of the provisions of the Payne-Aldrich bill, and upon the floor of the House as well, the attention of the country was called time after time to the sale in foreign markets of American goods at percentages and prices enormously below those which were required to be paid by American consumers.

Mr. REED. And it was defended on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; defended as an economic necessity, and due, of course, to the production of more goods than the domestic market could consume.

I recall, Mr. President, reading during those days of the importation from Europe to America of a line of cheap watches which the importers were able to sell to the American consumer, after paying freight twice across the Atlantic, for less than a similar article manufactured by the same institution could be secured for here. I do not defend that practice; I never did; but I am unable, Mr. President, to see wherein practices which we doubtless taught our competitors, and which certainly did exist in certain lines of industry, notably in the dye industry, and by the connivance of the textile manufacturers of the United States, should be used at this time as an argument for legislation, based, as I say, upon conditions of which we know practically nothing beyond the fact that the menace which lies at the basis of it is much more imaginary than real.

Now, Mr. President, when you take this antidumping bill, and consider also the embargo features of the dye bill—both of which are unique pieces of protective legislation, both of which are prohibitory in their character, under neither of which can the Government of the United States obtain any revenue, but which in their operation will continue war prohibitive conditions—we are driven to one conclusion, namely, that the manufacturers of the United States have discovered, through their enjoyment of absolute prohibition under war conditions a most unique method, through legislation, of continuing those conditions in times of peace; and by substituting licenses and antidumping features, which are but the entry of the head of the camel into the protection tent, those methods of so-called protection will ultimately become substitutes for tariff duties.

Why not? If importations can be stopped at the port of reception, or if before they are permitted to cross the sea a license must be secured from some bureau down here in Washington, or, what is better, if permission must be obtained from an embargo commissioner, what is the use of a system of protective tariffs? Why not do away with tariffs? They do not bring much to the Government, anyway, when they are too high; their administration is complicated and sometimes difficult, sometimes ineffectual. Constant legislation is had either to reduce or to expand them. They never have been permanently established.

If our Republican friends carry the next election, they will not "do a thing" to the Underwood-Simmons tariff bill. They are whetting their chops now over the anticipatory blessings that are to come from a change of administration. They are already proposing, in addition to these special features of protection, a line of duties for so-called war industries that will make poor old Aldrich turn over in his grave if he hears of them; and all upon the phantom apprehension that the competitive manufacturing nations of the world, with untold millions of dollars' worth of goods piled up upon the wharves of the

ports of Europe, will invade the markets of the United States and accomplish what the military power of Germany failed to do.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GAY in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Missouri? Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. REED. And if the Senator from Colorado will permit a suggestion, at the very time that they are telling us that these vast quantities of goods are piled up and ready to be dumped in America, they are telling us that Europe is starving to death and freezing to death, and that the people of the Old World have neither clothing nor shoes nor food; and yet they would have us believe that there are vast quantities of merchandise there unconsumed and ready to be shipped to this country and sold at ridiculously low prices.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; Mr. President, the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri is a most apt one. One or the other of these positions can not be correct, for otherwise the manufacturers of Europe are far more heartless than our manufacturers were ever charged with being, because they are permitting their own people to suffer for the necessities of life in order that they may flood the American markets with their goods.

Mr. REED. And sell them cheaply.

Mr. THOMAS. And sell them cheaply, so cheaply, indeed, that the great monopolies of America will be ruined if those goods are permitted to come.

Oh, Mr. President, I have the highest respect for my associates upon the committee; I have no intention, even indirectly, of impeaching their sincerity in the consideration and support of this and kindred measures. I can only account for their state of mind, however, by assuming that they have blindly accepted the representations which have been made by the beneficiaries of these proposed measures and would hasten legislation before this session of Congress adjourns lest panic and ruin and bankruptcy overwhelm the country between now and the occurrence of the next Presidential election.

The report of the Tariff Commission is confined principally to a discussion of the operations of the Canadian measure, which is both condemned and approved by Canadians interested in its operation. It is said that other countries have also enacted antidumping legislation, but the only other instance which is discussed in the report of the commission is that of Australia. I am in receipt of a copy of a telegram, dated the 24th day of April last, regarding the proposed Balfour dumping bill in Great Britain, which I will read:

According to a cable from United States Commercial Attaché Hutchinson at London, made public to-day by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the Balfour bill, designed to protect the tea industry and prevent dumping, has been rejected on second reading by a majority of 1.

Great Britain was in the war much longer than we, but she seems to be recovering her commercial equilibrium much more rapidly than is the United States. Doubtless her commercial agencies have long ago satisfied themselves that the evils sought to be remedied by this sort of legislation were more imaginary than actual. Whatever the reason may be, however, I can not but believe that the action of the British House of Commons upon this subject is wise and will prove to be so by the passage of events.

I had occasion yesterday in discussing the bill relating to the dyestuffs industry, which claims to need an embargo in order to protect it against German dye competition, to direct attention to the economic condition of the German people and also to the economic features of the treaty in order to establish my contention that competition from German sources in the dye industry for the next few years is an economic and physical impossibility. I then pointed out also that the amount of German dyes on hand was not only insufficient to meet the demands, but that, because of that fact, England and France had both repealed their embargoes against German dyestuffs and were anxious to get them.

One has but to read in the magazines and in the dispatches day after day what the economic and political conditions of Germany are to form a perfectly sane and, I think, sound opinion regarding the condition of that unhappy people. The Saturday Evening Post, which I bought this morning, contains an article upon the subject from the pen of Will Irwin, who I do not think can be accused of any bias toward Germany, who represents this paper in Europe, and who says, among other things, in an article from his pen which appears in that magazine:

The general statements heard all last winter to the effect that Germany was working while the rest of us struck and loafed, that she was piling up goods to flood our markets, circulate no longer. The allied council has somewhat tardily realized that Germany can never pay the bill unless she is granted raw materials and fed.

I might pause here to emphasize the fact that the textile manufacturers in Germany are without raw materials. She was our third best customer for them before the war. My recollection is that our annual exports of cotton to Germany prior to 1914 were about \$150,000,000. She has not the credit nor the goods to exchange for that cotton to-day. If she had, I should like the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] to consider what a calamity it would be to the cotton producers of Dixie if they were compelled to accept German goods in exchange for cotton at 50 cents a pound. But she has them not. Neither has she the money, for the character of money now in Germany is also mentioned by this author:

The allied council has somewhat tardily realized that Germany can never pay the bill unless she is granted raw materials and fed; and the allied council is educating the public in order to get opinion back of certain measures that will be resisted by private interests. But from the American newspapers I cull here and there one kind of general statement which gives a most untrue picture of German life and conditions to-day. It has to do with prices in Berlin. For example, an American manufacturer, back from a flying trip, announced to the reporters that living was cheap in Berlin; he had bought there an excellent pair of shoes for \$4, which couldn't be done at home. I have seen other paragraphs to the same effect. And it might be just as well to set forth here what \$4 American means to the average German.

The mark is at present worth about a cent—sometimes a few mills more, sometimes a few mills less. It used to be worth a quarter. And the only fair test of living conditions is what a mark is worth to a German.

From the point of view of one who has an American income the situation is a kind of nightmare comedy, best illustrated by the present happy situation of our Army of the Rhine about Coblenz. The humblest American doughboy gets \$33 a month, with free board, lodging, clothes, and medical attendance. Reenlisted men, noncommissioned officers, and those who perform special services on the side get more. Probably the average soldier in the army of occupation gets somewhat more than \$40 a month over and above the necessities of life. In February the paymaster's department set the official rate of exchange at 100 marks to the dollar. An income of \$40 a month became 4,000 marks a month. Let us say for the sake of easy calculation that the average pay of the enlisted men and "noncoms" is 50,000 marks a year—which is not far from the fact. Probably no salaried German in our zone of occupation gets as much. The highest salary of a German official in that region is, I believe, only 12,000 marks a year.

Fifty thousand marks a year is the interest, at the conservative rate of 5 per cent, on 1,000,000 marks—and our doughboy has food, clothes, and lodgings thrown in. By this calculation we may behold the Ameroc force as it appears to the natives of Coblenz—an army of millionaires! And so they deport themselves. In such a situation as now confronts Germany the rise in prices always lingers far behind the fall in the exchange value of money. For a long time the price of diamonds in and about Coblenz was about \$100 a carat. Doughboy report has it—with what truth I know not—that the New York price is about \$500 a carat. Whereupon they all saved or borrowed, and invested in diamonds. When they bought rings for themselves they wore them. When they bought rings for the girls at home they wore them also—on their little fingers. Nowadays as the drill sergeant commands "Carry arms!" a blinding glitter runs along the line.

Translating commodities back into American terms, a good razor costs 30 cents; a string of real amber beads for your girl, one to two dollars; a walking stick, from 10 cents to \$1; a bottle of champagne, 40 cents.

That last item arouses recollections of the most pleasing and delightful character.

As a result of strikes and favoring Government measures workingmen's wages have been steadily advanced since the armistice. A common laborer now gets 2 marks an hour, a skilled mechanic 3½ marks or sometimes 4. The 44-hour week is now universal. Therefore the laborer, if he has steady employment, earns 88 marks a week; the skilled workman, 154 to 176 marks a week. To get American values calculate the mark as a cent.

As I have explained in the previous article, all food except game and poultry is theoretically rationed in Germany—and only theoretically. The people will not abide by the Government system of rationing, which is below the starvation line, anyway, and the Government has not the machinery of enforcement.

To get our basis of comparison, then, let us take a common laborer with steady work. He earns at most 88 marks a week. Ignoring his necessary expense for Government-rationed bread, for rent, for fuel, for transportation if he lives far from his work, his week's pay will get 1 pound of butter at 35 marks, 1 pound of sugar at 16 marks, 2 pounds of beef at 12 marks a pound, and 6 eggs. Read the current prices in your morning newspaper, figure the total cost in current American money of a pound of butter, a pound of sugar, 2 pounds of beef and 6 eggs, and you find what a laborer's weekly salary means in Berlin.

"Speaking economically," said a German, "our middle class at this moment is tending to disappear. Part, through speculation and graft, are rising into the economic upper class; most of the rest are fading back into the economic lower class." For a great part of the middle class, lacking the weapon of the strike, is in bad straits. Stenographers, for example, get now 400 to 600 marks a month. The lowest of these salaries is a few marks a month better than the earnings of the common laborer; the highest, lower than that of the skilled mechanic.

Of course, Mr. President, payment of a workman in marks as compared with the payment of a workman in dollars gives an apparent great advantage to the former; but when you consider that it is impossible for him, owing to the difference in exchange, to earn a decent livelihood except for Government help, and that Government help is possible only through an enormous swelling of the national debt, which not only increases the necessary annual expenditures of the Government

but also tends ultimately to make that burden absolutely unbearable should the debt ever be redeemed, or should the attempt be made to redeem it, in gold, the effect upon the industrial morale of the people can be well imagined; and when to that you add the further reflection that practically every dollar of profit made by these institutions must go to pay the allied indemnities, the total amount of which will not be fixed until the 1st day of May, 1921, how is it possible for the manufacturer or the laborer or any other subject of the Empire to continue to possess those elements of enterprise, that selfish enlightenment, which prompt men to work for gain?

If every dollar made by the people of the South had been taken from them by the Government of the United States as a penalty for their throwing the country into civil war in 1861, or, to be more precise, if such a penalty had been imposed upon the southern people as a part of the reconstruction scheme, the South to-day would be as poor and as desolate as it was when Lee surrendered his army at Appomattox, for production rests upon the ambition of the individual. In its last analysis it means the desire of that individual to improve his condition; and if such improvement is impossible, regardless of his efforts to that end, there is no incentive for his exerting himself at all. Hence the lack of what might be called industrial morale from one end of the former Empire of Germany to the other.

I think I have read enough from this article to indicate its general tenor. Senators who desire to pursue it further will find it one of the most interesting contributions to the subject that have so far appeared in print in America. So the bugaboo of dumpage, when applied to Germany, has not even the substantive proportions of a nightmare.

Now, let us take France. The war rested more heavily upon France than any other nation engaged in it, certainly any other western nation, Belgium not excepted. The French occupied territory was denuded of everything of a material character that the Germans could carry off or destroy. They did not content themselves with that, for they forcibly deported a great percentage of the population. They flooded the mines, thereby demonstrating that the German war of 1914 was a war of commercial as well as of political conquest. The French people—men, women, and children—were enlisted for the war, and production was necessarily limited to the barest necessities of life. The exports from France since the war have been practically negligible. The great disproportion between her exports and her imports has presented to her people perhaps the most serious financial problem that has so far arisen from the war. In southern France there is an excess of wines and liquors. They can not very well be dumped upon the shores of the United States, nor, even if the provisions of the Volstead law were modified to the extent demanded from some sources, could they come here. Her silks, if she had any, would find competition in the mills of America, which are able to-day to manufacture a better quality at a lower price. It certainly can not be contended, therefore, that we are confronted with the danger of dumpage from France.

Italy was not so badly treated; but Italy's unfortunate lack of coal and of raw materials has so badly crippled her productive activities that she is to-day upon the very border of national bolshevism. Only a day or two ago it was announced that the Italian Government proposed to put an inhibition upon the use of gasoline in passenger automobiles because of the lack of gasoline for actually necessary purposes in that Kingdom. There is no danger of dumping from there.

Belgium is doing better than any of the other allies in the war. She has had fewer labor disturbances. She has rallied to the new conditions of the nation more universally than any other people suffering from the war. Her manufactories are showing signs of productive activity and her coal mines are working full blast. But, Mr. President, Belgium was never a serious competitor with America except in glass and one or two other commodities.

In 1913, when the Finance Committee had the Underwood bill under consideration, the glass manufacturers of the United States insisted that a reduction of the duties they were then enjoying would put them out of business; and on paper they came very near proving it. Their competitor was Belgium, where enormous quantities of glass were made with cheap labor, and whose expansion would in all probability overwhelm the American market under a low rate of duty. Congress passed the measure, however, without change, and it is a singular fact that very soon afterwards the glass manufacturers of the United States began to pay dividends. No tariff was ever yet reduced, and certainly no tariff was ever lowered, without confronting the assurance that it meant grave injury and possible destruction to the business.

England, the greatest manufacturer of all, is exporting some goods. She is exporting a great many articles of merchandise to the United States. She is restoring her lines of international traffic, and supplying some of her old customers with much-needed articles. But, Mr. President, any excess of imports from Great Britain to this country is due to our very impolitic treatment of the dye situation, and results in the importation into America of vast quantities of shirtings, dyed with German dyes, and which the American market for shirtings inexorably demands, tariff or no tariff. They are not sending them here at low prices. I ordered a couple of shirts a few days ago. Two shirts in these days is about all a man of ordinary income can afford, one to wear while the other is in the wash. I ordered two very cheap shirts, and by cheap shirts I mean shirts which at prevailing prices were of ordinary character. They will cost me \$6.50 apiece. I am inclined to think, from the looks of the material, that they will be made of imported shirtings, carrying German dyes in all probability. That sort of dumping does not make me feel very comfortable, if it is dumping.

Mr. President, the proponents of this bill, in my judgment, will be unable to specify the importation in quantity of goods from any other country since the war.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. THOMAS. With pleasure.

Mr. SMOOT. If I had time, I would specify to the Senator; and if he does not object—and I do not think he will, as 2 o'clock is nearly here—I wish to say that if it were not for what I will call the danger—because I consider it danger—of the importation of aeroplanes from England at this particular time, which, to my mind, would unquestionably close the concerns manufacturing aeroplanes in this country, there would be no particular necessity for the immediate passage of this antidumping bill. I think the Senator was in the Chamber when I called it up a few days ago and made that statement.

Mr. THOMAS. No; I was in New York on that occasion. May I ask the Senator a question right there?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. Is it not a fact that this aeroplane situation developed after this bill had reached the Senate and was under consideration?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. THOMAS. The first time I ever heard of it was in connection with this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that we knew of that situation before the bill was ever reported to the Senate. The propaganda for the selling of aeroplanes in America developed, however, about the time we were considering this bill in the committee. I would like, of course, to save our manufacture of aeroplanes in the United States, if possible. I recognize that the importation of goods into the United States now is increasing each month. During the month of February of this year there was an increase of 100 per cent as compared with the importation of goods in the same month last year.

Mr. THOMAS. Does not the Senator approve of that? Is he not glad of it?

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to say, even if the Senator had not asked the question, that I am not objecting to the importation of any goods where they are imported regularly, but we have a case in hand here, and I do not know but that if some action is not taken the manufacture of aeroplanes in this country will cease for a number of years to come.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. NUGENT. I desire to ask the Senator from Utah if he does not believe that the aeroplane question could be satisfactorily taken care of through a separate bill?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I will say to the Senator that that could be done. I have not any doubt about it at all. But I do not want to have it understood that I am opposed in any way to an antidumping law. I think, Mr. President, if we go into this far enough I can demonstrate beyond the question of a doubt that it is necessary for the future development of our industries in this country, and the industries of the country would have been a great deal better off, and I think the dyestuffs bill never would have been before the Senate of the United States at this time, if we had had a real antidumping law in effect in the years past.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. President, I desire further to ask the Senator if he does not believe that it would be good policy to recommit this bill to the Committee on Finance, with instruc-

tions to hold hearings, in order that we may ascertain the facts in connection with the manufacture of goods throughout the entire world, so far as they can be obtained, so that when the matter is finally considered by the Senate we will have something concrete upon which to base our conclusions?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator's suggestion would be a wise one if we did not know already that the provisions of the bill do not affect the regular channels of trade in any way, shape, or form; I mean the honest channels of trade. When I say the honest channels of trade I expect the Senator immediately to think of the exportation of American goods to foreign countries where they have been sold in the past for less than the prices at which they were sold in this country. But in many of the countries to-day that can not be done, because of the very fact that they have protected themselves through antidumping legislation. I want America to protect itself; and I will say, now that with the lack of goods in the world—and I say the world because I think that there is even a lack of them in the United States—if we produce enough of them in the United States competition itself will bring the price down to a reasonable figure. But with that lack of goods I do not think there is very much immediate danger. I take the same position as that taken by the Senator from Colorado, that as long as there is a shortage of goods in the world there is not very much chance of any country undertaking to dump any great quantity or any number of lines of goods in the United States.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. Thanking the Senator from Colorado for his courtesy, I send the following amendment to the desk and ask to have it printed. It proposes to amend the pending bill by striking out the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

An act to perpetuate existing high prices and to encourage monopoly.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

BENEFICIARIES OF VOCATIONAL TRAINING.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up the bill (H. R. 12266) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, as amended by the act of July 11, 1919.

Mr. SMOOT. It will not lead to any debate?

Mr. KENYON. I think not. I will state that all there is involved in the bill is an amendment to the vocational rehabilitation act for the benefit of soldiers, increasing the amount for the maintenance of a soldier without dependents from \$80 to \$100 and of a soldier with dependents from \$100 to \$120.

While I say it increases the amounts, it is optional with the Vocational Board as to whether to allow that much. That is all there is to it. The bill has passed the House unanimously. There are a number of injured soldiers who want to take the vocational training who can not do so because the amounts allowed are not sufficient in certain cases to pay their expenses.

Mr. WARREN. I ask that the bill may go over until I may have an opportunity to examine it. I want to be certain, and I suppose the Senator would, of course, like to be certain, that the men may obtain through this Vocational Board enough to properly sustain them in every reasonable way, but not enough above the ordinary payments they would receive through their regular employment if or when well and at work, so that some men might take advantage and, instead of shirking, they might be working with those who are patriotically laboring in production for those who are not to be helped by the Vocational Board. I want men who, when well and able to work, will help in production rather than take advantage of the higher rate of pay accorded by a grateful Government to those who are in real need.

Mr. KENYON. I do not believe it is exactly an eleemosynary institution to help the men who have been disabled in this war to whom we are trying to give some chance in lines of industry which will prepare them to make a living.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I will state that the original bill provides that this act can only be extended to those who, on account of their physical injuries, can not pursue their original lines of work.

Mr. WARREN. But, Mr. President, I have been informed, and I wish to look it up a little, that some of the physicians who are getting \$3 for each examination they make of these soldiers, and others, are passing them up for aid, examining them and reexamining them, for higher pay, and so forth, with-

out any seeming cause except, perhaps, the \$3 the examiner gets. Those, of course, are not true soldiers, and it does not speak well for the profession, but I understand that until we can rid the Government of the employment of at least some of those persons we had better be a little careful how we raise the allowance.

Mr. KENYON. Had we better cease taking care of these soldiers because there may be a few unworthy doctors?

Mr. WARREN. By no means; but there is no reason because of the feeling in this country of gratitude to the soldiers, which you and I intensely feel, why we should entertain a line of some almost deadbeats, who have only in mind the grand old flag provided they can get under it an appropriation or a living without honest endeavor and action.

Mr. KENYON. Let us get rid of those deadbeats.

Mr. WARREN. Exactly. That is what I want to get at.

Mr. KENYON. But do not let the deadbeats affect justice to the soldiers.

Mr. WARREN. No; not by any means. I expect to look up the matter very soon. There are a few matters in connection with the sundry civil appropriation bill which is now in the House under debate, which bill does not bear perhaps directly upon these salaries or allowances, but it does in some particulars bear very forcibly upon the general subject.

Mr. KENYON. I shall call up the bill after a reasonable time.

THE DYE INDUSTRY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 8078.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8078) to regulate the importation of coal-tar products, to promote the establishment of the manufacture thereof in the United States, and, as incident thereto, to amend the act of September 8, 1916, entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Glass	Lodge	Simmons
Borah	Gronna	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.
Brandegee	Hale	McLean	Smith, Ga.
Capper	Harding	McNary	Smith, Md.
Comer	Harris	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Culberson	Henderson	Nugent	Smoot
Cummins	Hitchcock	Overman	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Swanson
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Thomas
Elkins	Kellogg	Pittman	Trammell
France	Kendrick	Ransdell	Underwood
Frelighuysen	Kenyon	Reed	Walsh, Mass.
Gay	Keyes	Sheppard	Warren
Gerry	King	S Shields	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

VALUE OF COTTON CONTRACTS.

Mr. COMER. Mr. President, following my discussions of March 25, 30, April 1, 3, 17, and 29, regarding the operation of the cotton-futures act, pointing particularly to the unreliability of the exchange values with spot-cotton values and the serious loss which comes to the trade from same and pointing out methods of relief in the form of an amendment to the Smith-Lever amendment to the cotton-futures act as made in March, 1919. To this the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSELL] on April 30 interposed objections and contra reasons, and I will now endeavor to clear up his objections to the passage of the amendment and to show that the amendment to the Smith-Lever amendment of last year will simply help carry out the purpose of the entire act. The original Smith-Lever bill was enacted because of the serious irregularities practiced by the cotton exchanges in contract cotton manipulations and deliveries, which manipulations made within the law resulted in seriously depressing the cotton market and causing great losses to legitimate dealers on the exchange, making legitimate business practically impossible.

It was found that the original Smith-Lever bill did not accomplish the desired results, did not stabilize the value of cotton, and the Smith-Lever amendment of March 18, 1919, was inserted as a rider on the Agricultural bill and passed exactly like the proposed Comer amendment and for the same purpose. In other words, the Comer amendment is offered exactly like the Smith-Lever amendment of last year, and has for its sole design the enabling of the Smith-Lever amendment to accomplish the design of the amendment, which was the proper functioning

of the exchange, stabilizing the exchange cotton contract with the spot-cotton price.

In the address made by the Senator from Louisiana he quoted Mr. Butler, president of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, as objecting to the amendment because of its want of clarity. I thought Mr. Butler's objection was correct, and at my request the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] very kindly drew the following amendment to the Comer amendment, meeting Mr. Butler's objection and clarifying the proposed amendment:

Provided, That not less than one-half of each lot of cotton tendered for delivery on, under, or in settlement of a contract for the sale of basis middling made under section 5 of the cotton futures act as amended by the act approved March 4, 1919, on any sale after September 30, 1920, shall be of standard grades of middling or above, consisting of middling fair, strict good middling, good middling, strict middling, or middling.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSELL] also read into the RECORD a letter to Mr. Wannamaker from Mr. Thompson, ex-president of the Cotton Exchange of New Orleans, from which I quote, in part:

In times past I have made a rather close study of the future contract and I have long since come to the conclusion that its chief and, indeed, its only value lies in the protection it affords buyers and sellers of cotton and manufacturers of cotton goods.

I wish to call the Senator's particular attention that Mr. Thompson states the proper function of an exchange exactly as I have asserted all along. I read further:

When the future contract market functions normally, the owner of cotton, pending such time as he can market the same, or, if he be a farmer, before he has made the same, can insure himself against loss by selling a future contract hedge; the cotton buyer can make forward contracts with the spinner before he has any cotton in hand and protect himself against loss by buying a future contract hedge; and the manufacturer may make forward contracts for the sale of his product before he has cotton in hand or a specific grade contract with spot merchant or broker and insure himself against loss by buying a future contract hedge.

This is exactly what we have urged all along. That is a proper function of the cotton exchange. The proper function is a hedge, a legitimate hedge, either to buy or sell, which is a business proposition. Of course, under this any man can speculate if he wishes to, but he ought to speculate with even chances, just like you throw a half dollar in the air and bet whether or not it will hit the crack, just as you have done many times, but it ought to be an even chance of heads or tails, the only advantage being to the best prognosticator of the crop, large or small, as to how the supply and demand is going to be, successfully diagnosing the futures trade condition, either to buy or sell. This is legitimate and properly belongs to the best judgment.

Mr. Thompson says further:

I am opposed to the Comer amendment because, in my opinion, it so narrows the contract that its effect would be to drive out sellers, which would have the effect of running up the prices of the contract to abnormal premiums, which in turn would eventually destroy the future contract as a trade agency for hedging purposes. If this were the case, there would then be no reason for the existence of a future-contract market and it would not be tolerated.

There is where we draw the diverging line between the exchange contention and the effect of the Comer amendment. We contend that the law, amended as proposed, will stabilize the market, will make it a real insured hedge, just as he says, and beyond that no one proposes to go. The contract will go higher, of course; will promote rather than demote futures business; and the futures business will increase and grow in favor just as an honest business improves over dishonest business.

The Senator from Louisiana quoted extensively from State Senator Percy. I will say that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] told me that Senator Percy was opposed to the bill, and I wrote to Senator Percy, who is a friend of mine—I am very fond of him—to know about it and inclosed a copy of the amendment in my first presentation. His reply was inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSELL], with my consent. I think he was very clear on the question. But I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Louisiana to the closing sentence of Senator Percy's letter:

However, I do not believe that any grave disaster would result from the adoption of the amendment.

Note that:

However, I do not believe that any grave disaster would result from the adoption of the amendment.

If that statement is true—and the Senator quoted it from him and said he was smart enough to know what he is talking about—that contradicts every statement the exchanges have made—every one. If that statement is true, if Senator Percy has diagnosed the case right—that the amendment is not sinister, that it will not hurt the exchange—then I charge that the whole argument falls to the ground as a result.

The Senator has quoted him as a guide in the matter; he has quoted him as one who is competent to guide; and yet he says the amendment is not sinister; but in every argument the exchanges have made they say the amendment is sinister; that it will destroy the cotton exchanges and do great injury to the cotton business. That is what they say. The Senator from Louisiana has quoted ex-Senator Percy injudiciously. I think he made a mistake in quoting him at all. He said:

My own interest is as a cotton producer. I do not entertain the idea that there is anything sinister in the amendment or that it is designed to operate in favor of the spinners.

And yet these are the very things they have been asserting. The whole fabric of the opposition is based on the amendment being sinister and operating in favor of spinners. I repeat, the Senator from Louisiana quoted ex-Senator Percy injudiciously.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Gay in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. COMER. Certainly.

Mr. RANDELL. Has the Senator from Alabama finished quoting the letter of ex-Senator Percy? If so, I desire to ask him a question.

Mr. COMER. Anything the Senator from Louisiana desires to ask me I shall be very glad to answer. He was very kind to me the other day, and he may ask me anything he pleases and take as much of my time as he desires.

Mr. RANDELL. I thank the Senator from Alabama very much. The Senator says that I have quoted Senator Percy incorrectly. In reply I desire to state that I quoted ex-Senator Percy's entire letter. The Senator from Alabama will admit that, will he not?

Mr. COMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANDELL. I quoted every word of the letter except a personal allusion in the closing paragraph in regard to the Senator from Alabama hunting with ex-Senator Percy, and I knew the Senator from Alabama did not desire that I should include that. However, I quoted everything that bore on this subject, and let us now see whether I quoted him incorrectly. He says:

I believe that the amendment to the present contract would make dealings fewer, and the frequency of transactions on the exchanges is beneficial to the producer simply as affording information as to prices and their fluctuation. Since the present contract has been made—

I assume that he alludes to the Smith-Lever law contract. That law was passed in 1914, reenacted in 1916, and an amendment to it adopted in 1919. I assume that that is what he means by "present contract." I continue reading from his letter—

there has been no breaking of the market on tenders in any considerable amount of spot cotton. To make the contract harder to fill for the seller would lessen the number of transactions, and would in all probability make the contracts reflect a higher value than the average value of spot cotton that the trade has become accustomed to; furthermore, the trade has become accustomed to the present contract, and it is the same contract which is in use in Liverpool. I do not believe it would be made a better barometer in reflecting the prices of the actual cotton by the amendment.

It seems to me words could not indicate more plainly than those that ex-Senator Percy is opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama. He thinks that if the amendment should be adopted it would not afford a "better barometer." He does add the words to which the Senator refers, that he does not believe the Senator's motives were sinister, and I desire to say to the Senator from Alabama that I do not believe his motives were designing. I believe he was perfectly sincere. Ex-Senator Percy says that as a producer of cotton he does not think the contract would be bettered; that the amendment would make it more difficult of fulfillment; in consequence would lessen the number of transactions on the exchanges; and finally destroy the contract to which the trade is accustomed—the same contract used in Liverpool, the cotton center of the world. Those are the important points of his argument against the Senator's amendment and explain why I read the letter. Ex-Senator Percy, well versed in the trade practices, is a very able man and a very large producer of cotton.

Mr. COMER. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator from Louisiana does not think my motives were sinister or doubt my perfect sincerity in the matter.

In reference to the question as to whether or not it would reduce the number of sellers, that is not a very great factor any way. I do not myself believe there would be as many gamblers on the market; I mean that class who only go in when they have an unlawful advantage, which is not unlike a marked card or loaded

dice game. I myself do not believe that there would be a greater combination to bear the market. That is the very thing against which we are fighting. If you want to encourage such gambling in cotton it can be accomplished under the present system. This is why the exchanges are fighting the amendment, but if it is desired to secure fair dealing and stabilize prices, so that anybody can go into the business with perfect safety, I mean so far as the gambling is concerned, then we should amend existing legislation; and the amendment which I have offered is not detrimental to any interest.

I am glad the Senator from Louisiana has again laid stress on the letter of ex-Senator Percy; but if the Senator will excuse me, he did not read the letter accurately. He said that I had not done anything which was sinister, but the letter itself says that the amendment is not at all sinister. Mr. Percy says the amendment is not going to hurt; he means the amendment will not hurt the exchanges themselves and nothing can hurt them so long as there is honesty in business. That is just exactly what the amendment is meant to accomplish.

Mr. RANDELL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. COMER. Certainly.

Mr. RANDELL. The Senator continues to emphasize the point against gamblers. Does he mean to say that ex-Senator Percy is a gambler in cotton? Is that the purport of the Senator's argument? Ex-Senator Percy is very much opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama. Now, does the Senator from Alabama pretend to say that ex-Senator Percy is a gambler? Mr. Percy says he is a producer of cotton, and he makes the point that, as a producer of cotton, he is opposed to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Percy certainly is not the kind of gambler that this amendment is designed to checkmate.

Mr. RANDELL. It may be that some of us who are producers of cotton also bet. I rather think the Senator from Alabama himself said he had bought some futures. He told us about a trade between himself and one of the New Orleans merchants, in which he said, in substance, that he had been treated very badly by that merchant, from whom he bought 100 bales of cotton. I tried to get the Senator to tell the Senate who sold him that 100 bales, but he failed to do so. So ex-Senator Percy may be a speculator, but he could hardly be called a gambler, I imagine. I should very much dislike to have that term applied to him.

Mr. COMER. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Louisiana has mentioned the transaction in New Orleans to which I formerly referred. I am going to state the figures to the Senator, if he please.

Mr. RANDELL. I shall be delighted to hear them, but I wish the Senator would first tell me whether ex-Senator Percy is a gambler.

Mr. COMER. The Senator from Louisiana must not be personal, if he please. I will ask him, however, if he ever knew a man from the Delta of the Mississippi who was not a gambler or sportsman enough to take a chance?

Mr. RANDELL. I can look into the mirror and see one. I live in the Delta of the Mississippi, and I am not a gambler.

Mr. COMER. The Senator must feel very lonely sometimes. The hundred bales of cotton of which I spoke and concerning which the Senator inquires were bought through the Howell Cotton Co., of Birmingham, Ala., and were delivered through Lowrey & Co. at New Orleans. I should like to have the Senator pay particular attention to the figures I am about to read.

Mr. RANDELL. I shall be delighted to listen.

Mr. COMER. They show exactly how the transaction was carried out. I sent a copy to Senator SMITH of South Carolina, Senator SMITH of Georgia, and to the Bureau of Markets, and I secured this copy from the Bureau of Markets yesterday. The following is a copy of the invoice as made to our company:

J. J. LOWREY & Co.,
New Orleans, La., May 14, 1918.

Statement of 97 bales of cotton received on May contracts for account of Howell Cotton Co.

Bales of cotton.	Grade.	Weight.	Off.	Amount off.
2	Low middling spots, lot 5556, Terrell.....	967	237	\$22.92
1	Low middling, lot 5535, Terrell.....	727	225	16.36
3	Low middling spots, lot 5580, Terrell.....	1,541	237	38.89
1	Low middling tinge, lot 5580, Terrell.....	429	275	11.80
1	Low middling, lot 5583, Terrell.....	417	200	8.34

Statement of 97 bales of cotton received on May contracts for account of Howell Cotton Co.—Continued.

Bales of cotton.	Grade.	Weight.	Off.	Amount off.
1	Low middling yellow light tinge, lot 5583, Terrell	496	275	\$13.64
4	Low middling spots, lot 5581, Terrell	1,977	237	46.85
1	Low middling, lot 5665, Terrell	502	200	10.04
1	Low middling yellow light tinge, lot 5635, Terrell	523	275	14.38
2	Low middling yellow light tinge, lot 5653, Terrell	907	275	24.91
2	Low middling yellow light tinge, lot 5654, Terrell	851	275	23.40
4	Low middling spot, lot 5636, Terrell	1,950	237	46.21
1	Strict low middling yellow light tinge, lot 5578, Terrell	572	163	9.32
4	Low middling spot, lot 5578, Terrell	2,225	237	52.73
2	Low middling, lot 5578, Terrell	1,013	200	20.26
1	Good middling, yellow stain, lot 5602, Terrell	1,450	88	4.22
1	Middling, yellow tinge, lot 5545, Terrell	480	88	4.22
1	Light to strict low middling, yellow light tinge, lot 5545, Terrell	342	219	7.49
1	Strict good ordinary to low middling, lot 5545, Terrell	559	263	14.70
1	Strict middling, off color, lot 5700, Terrell	610	88	14.82
3	Strict low middling, lot 5700, Terrell	1,684	88	14.82
2	Low middling, lot 5700, Terrell	969	200	19.35
1	Middling yellow stain, lot 5624, W. H.	504	125	6.30
4	Strict low middling, lot 5624, W. H.	2,000	88	17.60
1	Strict low middling, off color, lot 5624, W. H.	528	113	5.97
1	Low middling, off color, lot 5627, W. H.	341	225	7.67
1	Low middling, spots, lot 5627, W. H.	525	237	12.44
3	Low middling, yellow light tinge, lot 5627, W. H.	1,543	275	42.43
3	Low middling, off color, lot C-3918, W. H.	1,520	225	34.20
4	Low middling, spotted, lot C-3918, W. H.	2,263	237	53.63
3	Low middling, spots, lot 3010, W. H.	1,653	237	39.18
2	Low middling, yellow light tinge, lot 3910, W. H.	1,080	275	29.70
4	Low middling, lot C-2993, W. M.	1,984	200	39.63
1	Low middling, lot C-2981, W. H.	536	200	10.72
1	Low middling, off color, lot C-2981, W. H.	476	225	10.71
2	Low middling, spotted, lot C-2981, W. H.	1,034	237	24.51
3	Low middling yellow light tinge, lot C-3019, W. H.	1,155	275	31.76
1	Low middling yellow tinge, lot C-3019, W. H.	398	288	11.46
3	Middling yellow light tinge, lot C-2971, W. H.	1,945	75	14.59
1	Middling yellow light stain, lot C-2971, W. H.	536	100	5.36
1	Strict low middling yellow light tinge, lot C-3007, E. H.	419	163	6.83
1	Strict low middling yellow tinge, lot C-3007, E. H.	443	176	7.80
1	Low middling yellow tinge, lot C-3007, E. H.	556	288	16.01
2	Low middling spots, lot C-3011, W. H.	1,054	237	24.98
1	Low middling yellow light tinge, lot C-3011, W. H.	478	275	13.14
2	Strict low middling yellow light tinge, lot C-2998, W. H.	916	163	14.93
4	Strict good ordinary, lot C-2998, W. H.	1,938	325	62.98
2	Strict good ordinary to low middling, lot C-2974, W. H.	1,036	263	27.25
5	Strict good ordinary, lot C-2974, W. H.	2,488	325	80.86
Total		49,640		1,073.38

¹ Pass.

97 bales of cotton, weighing 49,640 pounds, at 25.95 cents— \$12,881.58
 Lot 5700, Terrell, 63 on— 3.84

Amount off— 12,885.42
 1,073.38

Compressing 97 bales, at 50 cents— 48.50
 One-half certificating 46 bales of cotton, at 18 1/2 cents— 8.63
 One-half certificating 51 bales of cotton, at 25 cents— 12.75
 Total— 11,881.92

The total was 97 bales, but the weight made it 100 bales.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From what document has the Senator been reading?

Mr. COMER. I have been reading from the absolute sales sheet from New Orleans of the 100-bale contract as delivered at New Orleans.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under a contract which the Senator had previously made?

Mr. COMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And what the Senator has read shows what was actually offered him on the contract?

Mr. COMER. Yes; what was actually delivered.

Mr. SHEPPARD. To the Senator on that contract?

Mr. COMER. Yes; on that contract. We shipped the cotton to the mill at Sylacauga and manufactured it. We have mills there that can manufacture any grade. What I have read shows the multiplex assembly and character of cotton that was actually delivered according to a copy of the sales sheet which has been in the Bureau of Markets since last year, I myself having secured a copy from the Bureau of Markets.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Can the Senator put in the Record at this point the contract which he made originally, so that we can compare the contract itself with the figures he has given?

Mr. COMER. The contract was for 100 bales of May cotton, bought under the original Smith-Lever bill as amended in 1916, and delivered within the terms of that law.

Mr. RANSDALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. COMER. I yield.

Mr. RANSDALL. I should like the Senator to tell us how many bales of that cotton were not spinnable. Was not all of that cotton spinnable?

Mr. COMER. I will go into a full explanation of that. There are mills that can spin anything. In our mills, as I have stated heretofore, we can spin anything from waste to strict good middling. We have two mills which do not use anything below strict middling, and if any of this cotton were shipped to them we could not have used a bale of it. We have three such mills now, which altogether have 80,000 spindles, and if we had shipped every single bale of this cotton to those mills they could not have used a bale of it. There are many mills, Senator, that could not have used one single, solitary bale of this—not one bale—and when they tendered this cotton, made up as you see it was, it was tendered with the knowledge that it could not be used.

Mr. RANSDALL. May I ask how many mills the Senator has that he says could not use that cotton?

Mr. COMER. I say our company has three mills that could not use it.

Mr. RANSDALL. Could it be used by any of your mills?

Mr. COMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANSDALL. How many of your mills could use it?

Mr. COMER. My own company?

Mr. RANSDALL. Yes; or your affiliated companies. I do not know how many mills you really have. I understood that you had quite a number—8 or 10, is it not?

Mr. COMER. Our company has eight. I put that in the Record the other day.

Mr. RANSDALL. How many spindles?

Mr. COMER. About 200,000.

Mr. RANSDALL. You say this cotton could have been used by some of your mills?

Mr. COMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANSDALL. Then, Senator, could it have been very bad if some of your mills could have used it?

Mr. COMER. That is not the question. The average mill could not have used it. The average cotton mill could not have used a bale of it.

Mr. RANSDALL. But, Mr. President—

Mr. COMER. Wait a minute, please—and when you sell to the trade any industrial commodity that can not be used by the average man, it is wrong.

Mr. RANSDALL. It was all spinnable cotton, though?

Mr. COMER. Spinnable, yes.

Mr. RANSDALL. And some of your mills could have used every bale that was tendered to you?

Mr. COMER. Surely.

Mr. RANSDALL. All right.

Mr. COMER. That cotton was from New Orleans. Here is a statement of some cotton that we received from New York. It was about the same time, and I will be candid with you. The futures act was in controversy, and we made the fight two years ago, and we published statements in the different papers of Georgia, Alabama, and South Carolina, and we carried the fight to the Agricultural Department.

Mr. Houston was Secretary at the time. Anybody is at liberty to take that correspondence and print every line of it. We were fighting for the people's rights, which were being disregarded.

We took up cotton on two contracts in New York and one in New Orleans for the special purpose of showing Congress what was being done under the law of the land. That is what we did it for. We did not have to take the cotton at all, but we wanted to have you see just what was going on, and we sent copies to the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and Georgia [Mr. SMITH] to show Congress just what was going on; and we demanded, as citizens and representatives of the business of this country, that we should be protected in the right to do a straight, square business. That is what we did. We took up two contracts in New York. I will read from the sales sheet—

Mr. RANSDALL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama further yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. COMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANSDALL. In order that we may understand the matter clearly as we go along, I wish the Senator would explain whether, in getting supplies of cotton for his mills, he purchases on a specific contract, in which he sets out the exact number of bales and kind of cotton he desires, to wit, middling, or strict middling, or good middling, or strict good middling, or middling fair, or low middling, and so forth. Does he make a specific, definite, concrete contract to be delivered, so many bales of particular grade, or does he depend upon getting supplies for his mills in the future market, on which the basis of the contract is middling?

Mr. COMER. Just as you said just now, Senator. You read Mr. Thompson's letter to Wannamaker, in which he declared that the function of the exchange was not to deliver cotton, but that it was insurance to protect the transactions in cotton. That is what it is for. We buy contracts for insurance or protection, and up to this time I want to show you how closely it was done. Up to April of last year, for quite a while, the exchange market had been running pretty fairly well along with the cotton market; but commencing in May the drop was 5 cents at one time, \$25 a bale. It came like a thunderclap on our business; and I say to you, Senator, that a law that allows such transactions as that is wrong.

Mr. RANSDALL. Will the Senator kindly answer my question?

Mr. COMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANSDALL. I say, assuming that you need 10,000 bales, or 50,000 bales—I do not know how many bales your mills would use; probably 50,000 bales—if you needed 50,000 bales, then would you make specific contracts to be delivered, those 50,000 bales of particular grades, a certain number of bales per month, or—repeating my question—would you depend upon getting them on a future contract, in the future market?

Mr. COMER. We could either ourselves hedge in the futures market, buying that much cotton for such months ahead as we would like, depending ourselves on buying direct, or from such sources as we saw proper, the spot cotton that we needed, and as the spot cotton was acquired could sell the hedge. In that event there would be no specific grade contract; again, we frequently buy specific grades from a dealer at a specific price, either made on a futures basis month or an absolute price which he has figured as based on a futures month; and this is really the "cream" of the stabilized market, because just as he can safely depend upon the futures market correlated with the spot market, then to such an extent would his contract be insured or noninsured.

Mr. RANSDALL. Then, do I understand the Senator to say that he makes specific contracts or that he does not?

Mr. COMER. We do not make specific contracts on the exchange.

Mr. RANSDALL. I do not mean on the exchange. I mean for the cotton which you need in your business, this 50,000 bales.

Mr. COMER. Thousands of bales of it; yes, sir.

Mr. RANSDALL. You make specific contracts?

Mr. COMER. Thousands of bales, yes; but not on the exchanges.

Mr. RANSDALL. You do not buy on the exchange, except, I presume, to insure or hedge against your actual transactions?

Mr. COMER. That is right.

Mr. RANSDALL. You use it, then, as a medium of insurance?

Mr. COMER. To be sure. That is what it is for. That is its function; and let me tell you, Senator, since you have brought up that question, this last year we all thought that the Smith-Lever bill was going to do. We all thought the amendment had accomplished its purpose and the contract market went along smoothly until last fall. Last summer and early fall the exchange prices were running along with the spot cotton prices, and there were thousands of dealers who sold middling and above, based on the exchange price. They sold cotton, and then bought futures; but in less than 60 days there was a revolution in the exchanges. Spot middling and above advanced from 200 to 300 points. It went up just like this; and those unfortunate dealers trusting your law for protection had sold spot cotton middling and above, basis contract middling, depending on the proper functioning of the exchanges because of the last amendment to the Smith-Lever bill lost tens of thousands of dollars, all because the exchanges failed to function as Mr. Thompson says they should.

It was wrong. It was wrong. They had insured in the exchanges. They had a right to expect the exchanges to function in the way the law intended they should function and the right to believe they were protected. Not merely in my section of the country but all through the country those people who trusted in the exchange market as it existed then, and sold the higher grades of cotton, middling and above, suffered because they did not anticipate that the exchanges would permit this great difference between the middling basis and the middling spots—a difference that was factitiously accomplished.

Mr. RANSDALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama further yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. COMER. Certainly.

Mr. RANSDALL. When you make a contract for middling and ask for specific delivery of the 100 bales under your contract, or the 1,000 bales under your 10 contracts—I believe 100 bales is called a contract, is it not?

Mr. COMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANSDALL. Now, assume that you have made a contract for 1,000 bales, let us say, of middling, and the New York Exchange or the New Orleans Exchange attempts to deliver you a certain percentage of that in low middling, for example, or strict low middling, will they not pay you the difference, the commercial difference or a fair difference, between the value of low middling and the value of that which they deliver?

Mr. COMER. If they paid the commercial difference, the differences as actually exist in the spot market and which the Smith-Lever bill intended, it would be right. It would straighten out the whole transaction, but they vary the differences between the grades and the actual difference in the spot market so much that no man can take account of it or guard against it.

Mr. RANSDALL. You mean the trouble is in the practical application of the matter, then?

Mr. COMER. Yes, sir; I mean when you bring it down to practical application, they are not there. That is what I mean.

Mr. RANSDALL. You mean they do not treat you fairly?

Mr. COMER. That is just exactly what I mean. The contract market as at present conducted admits of fictitious differentials between the grades of cotton tendered for delivery.

Mr. RANSDALL. If they do not treat you fairly at the present time, may I ask how you expect to get fair treatment even if your amendment should be adopted?

Mr. COMER. The amendment secures that one-half of the contract shall be middling and above, the tendency will be to make the basis of this contract on the actual spot price middling instead of basis spot price middling, as at present. The present contract basis middling is secured by getting the spot prices from actual spot sales from 10 spot markets on 10 different grades and from it compositing the differentials, making the basis middling, which is impossible.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I just wanted to say, on the particular point the Senator has raised, that my object in my amendment that was adopted and is now a law was, as I take it, in the main what the Senator from Alabama is attempting to bring about, namely, not so much to make the exchanges a spot market as to regulate them in such a way as to make them reflect the real commercial value of the spot market. In other words, the object was to restrict the grades delivered to such grades that in case they are called for delivery they will have to furnish those grades that are nearest the standard of comparison, above and below, so that at all times you may know what middling is worth; and when you sell a contract or buy a contract that contract will be bought and sold upon the basis of the middle or middling grade, which has been from time immemorial the standard of comparison.

Now, I wanted to suggest to the Senator that perhaps there was an evasion of the cotton-futures act, which penalized one for not discharging his obligations when called. I was informed—just how true it was I was not in a position to know, as I was not myself then engaged in the cotton business—that New York fixed a nominal sum as a penalty for nondelivery or default on the contract in case a buyer demanded the cotton.

I think it was some absurdly low figure; but, be that as it may, markets such as New Orleans and New York should be so regulated, or should themselves so regulate themselves, that when they quote January, February, March, April, or May, or any month of the year, at a certain figure, that will represent the price of middling cotton at that time. The public at large so considers it to-day, but through some manipulation of the figures it has not reflected that price.

If the Senator will recall when this difference between the low grades and the middle grades and between the middling

contract price and the middling spot price became so absurd, he came to Washington, and the Senator will remember that we were present with the then head of the Bureau of Markets, and I asked the question if the price then quoted for middling cotton represented the price of middling cotton, or whether it represented a composite, an average price of the grades that they would deliver. If you recall I never did get a specific and satisfactory answer to that question. Now the Senator proposes in his amendment to give the buyer the right to demand 50 per cent of any contract middling and better, so that any one selling even for a hedge will know that in case notice is given that the cotton will be taken up, he has got to go into the market or into the warehouses and get at least 50 per cent of middling and better.

In that respect it would have a tendency, in my opinion, to bring the quoted price, the board price, nearer in line with the spot price. Just what effect it will have upon the grades below is yet to be determined.

If the Senator will allow me, I think the disparity between middling grades and the low grades of cotton has been affected to a considerable degree by the unfortunate order of the Government, which the Senator recalls, that nothing should be made for a Government account, from horse collars to shirts, out of any cotton below middling, which had the effect on the market of still further lowering the difference between middling and the offgrades. But whether or not the still further restriction of the grades will intensify that difference remains to be seen.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] called attention to the fact that all this cotton was spinnable cotton. It is true that under the tests by the Government it was shown that so far as the tensile strength, the bleaching qualities, and the cloth-making qualities of the grades of cotton were concerned, from good ordinary to middling fair, they were negligible; but there was quite a difference in the per cent of waste, the foreign matter, that was in the lower grades of cotton.

However, I want to take this occasion, because I may not be present all the time this afternoon on account of circumstances over which I have no control, being obliged to attend a committee meeting, to say that the ultimate price of cotton is going to depend upon the law of supply and demand. What I have been striving for since I have been in the Senate, and I think I have approximated it through the aid and cooperation of the friends of this article, is to bring the market to where whatever price is quoted will reflect the price of the article based upon the law of supply and demand.

Mr. COMER. That is true, Senator.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. How near we have approximated that is shown in the market since the operation of the amendment to the cotton-futures act passed last March. I frankly admit that there has been some disappointment on my part that the spot market was not reflected precisely in the future market, but I understood that there would necessarily be a variation from it, in view of the fact that through the unfortunate Government order and the necessary accumulation of certain low grades the preponderance of the cotton to be delivered on any contract would be taken from the lower grades that were admissible. But even that has not, in my opinion, justified the variations of the spot quotations from middling and the quotations from the spot market.

Mr. COMER. May I read to you, Senator, just what the variation is?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; I would like to have it.

Mr. COMER. On February 20, in New York, March cotton was 36.52; May cotton was 34.34; July cotton was 32.12.

At New Orleans March cotton the same day was 37.48; May cotton was 34.84; July cotton was 32.67.

You will observe, Senator, that at New Orleans cotton was just a cent a pound higher for the March contract than at New York.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. What was the spot cotton on the dates the Senator mentioned?

Mr. COMER. I think it was around 40 or 41 cents; I am not sure, but it was around 40 cents.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. What was the date of that report?

Mr. COMER. That was February 20. I want to give the Senator the comparisons. On March 1, March in New York was 38.25. You see, it had gone up nearly a cent. May was 34.98; July was 32.40.

At New Orleans March cotton was 39 cents; May was 35.67; July was 32.94.

On March 15—I am just giving it to you in intervals of 15 days; I am not picking out any spectacular months—on March 15, March was 40 cents in New York; May cotton was 37.09; July was 34.20.

At New Orleans March was 39.20, a cent lower than New York. They just swapped a cent. May cotton was 37.25 and July cotton was 34.55.

On March 20—I am taking these five days apart—March in New York was 40.25, nearly up to the price for middling; May was 37.57; and July was 35.10.

At New Orleans the price was 39 cents for March, a cent and a quarter lower than New York, a basis change of 24 cents; 37.52 for May; and 34.96 for July.

On March 23 in New York March was 42.80; May was 38.76; and July was 35.96.

In New Orleans March was 39.60; May was 38; and July was 35.

In other words, New Orleans basis middling then was 34 cents lower than New York, and February 20 was a cent higher. Do you not see, Senator, that that is manipulation? Do you not see that is not a hedge? Do you not see that is not insurance? Do you not see that that was destruction of the very thing Thompson said he stood for? And do you not see it destroys the entire argument of Senator Percy when he said the thing was running satisfactorily along? Do you not see it? How can you understand the change of 6 cents a pound in a month when spot cotton had not changed a cent and a half? And yet you say that is fair. Fair is not the name for it.

On the 23d of March New York did go to 43.18, and they said it was a squeeze. New York had no cotton, and has none now, and when March was 36.52 and spot 40 cents, it was too big a temptation for the man on the outside not to take advantage of, and he called for some cotton; March contracts was called, March contracts advanced in New York; advanced to the price of what it cost to carry spot cotton there and deliver it, and when you urge the danger of these conditions you must consider that the man who is selling it on the exchange can ship the cotton and deliver it. Then, besides, he has the privilege under certain conditions of settling 25 points on the closing price of the expiring month. Both these constitute an absolute safety valve.

We want a market which does not change that way. We want a market that is stabilized. Stabilized on what? On spot cotton.

The exchanges can not make a flat value on cotton. It would be most dangerous if they could, and the claim of the exchanges establishing differences in grades and being of advantage to low grades, or any grades, is flat and is impossible of accomplishment. We failed to establish a flat price on silver as money, as it became dangerous, too dangerous to carry out. We can not even make a flat value on gold, the very basis of all currency, the value of it fluctuating with the market of the world; and how contemptible becomes the position of the exchanges' argument that they establish value in cotton, the different grades of it, being inlawed or outlawed as to value according to whether or not it is tenderable on the exchange.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator as to the real trouble with the present situation, and I presume I should preface it by saying I presume not 1 per cent of these men use the exchanges, but they are affected by the exchanges; but the mill people, when they sell a contract for goods and have not the cotton, buy a contract on the market in order to protect themselves against the exigencies under the market. Of course, the wide fluctuations to which the Senator calls attention are unfortunate.

Mr. COMER. It is outrageous.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. But the trouble with the hedging business, especially with the mills, is this, that they sell or buy, as the case may be, on the exchange as a protection, a hedge, against the spot transaction; so that if they sell a contract on the board to protect the purchase of spot cotton, and there is violent fluctuation on the board and none on the spots, they are likely to be knocked out of all profit they have on the cotton.

Mr. COMER. That is just what is the matter.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I say, that is the point. For instance, in the very case cited spot cotton remained practically stationary, while there was a decline in the future market of 3 or 4 cents a pound, which wiped out all protection, and yet the effect was felt by the producer only indirectly, in that it demoralized the purchasers, namely, those who were buying for mill account. So that it is not so much the fluctuation of the market that is disastrous to the hedger—that is, if spots and futures fluctuate *pari passu*—but it is when spots remain relatively firm and the futures go up and go down, because if I were to sell a contract on the New York Exchange today, say, at 40 cents, basis middling, intending to purchase my spot cotton, and from some manipulation of the market it should go down to 38, when spots went to 45, I would be just split wide open—

Mr. COMER. And under the law, which is wrong.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The result would be that I would have no hedge, and have to do one of two things—go out to the warehouses and buy my specific cotton first hand for my future needs, or stay out of the market as a hedge.

Mr. RANSDALL. Mr. President, would the Senator from Alabama permit me to ask a question?

Mr. COMER. Certainly.

Mr. RANSDALL. I wish to ask the Senator from South Carolina what would be the effect in the case he stated if the amendment of the Senator from Alabama be agreed to? How would it materially improve the situation?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The only thing in the premises, I take it, that the Senator from Alabama is striving to do is to so relate the spot and future markets that when one goes up the other goes up, and when one goes down the other goes down.

Mr. COMER. That is where they belong.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I knew that was what the Senator was attempting to do. But as to what effect the amendment would have—

Mr. RANSDALL. That is what I am trying to get at.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. As to just what effect the amendment may have on the general price of cotton is problematical, just as it was problematical when I had it restricted to 10 grades. I expected more benefit in a way, but I had not properly discounted the effect of the Government order. However, it remains to be seen; I do not know just what use those who deal in it will put it to.

Mr. RANSDALL. May I ask one other question in line with this?

Mr. COMER. Yes.

Mr. RANSDALL. The Senator from South Carolina, I take it, has been as great a student of this subject as we have in the country—certainly the most attentive student of it in the Senate—and he says that in his opinion the effect of the amendment would be very problematical. I imagine from that statement by the Senator that although he perhaps has thought a great deal about this matter, and notwithstanding his great knowledge and mastery of the subject, he must be in the greatest doubt as to whether or not we should adopt the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I frankly admit that I am a bit skeptical at this stage of the game of gratifying results from almost any law we may pass, for the reason that it seems as if there is some way found to evade the specific intent and purpose of the law.

But the purpose for which I rose was to ask the Senator from Alabama if it was his intent in the amendment to so legally bind the spot and future markets together as to make it impossible for one to rise without the other rising, pair fashion, and the decline of the same?

Mr. COMER. I can answer immediately—the very minute that this goes into effect as a law, that then the contract market would base on the middling market or very near to it. At present it is basis middling, which can, as I just showed you, be 4 or 5 cents a pound under the spot market. This will make it basis spot market and basis middling. You will have practically one basis. That is, I think it will operate that way.

Going on with my statement, on March 24 New Orleans had changed positions with New York about 4 cents a pound. Something was wrong, was it not? Then here is the 22d May, New York 40.91, July 38.85. It had changed 2 cents. Then, on April 29, May was 40.20 New York, July 38.20, and New Orleans was 39.20, a cent lower, and it had been running anywhere from three-quarters to a cent and a half higher.

The point is this: New York is now largely functioning, and functioning very close to the spot market. Is anything hurt by that fact? Do you not know it helps them; that if by any means it could be secured that New York and New Orleans should function together on the spot market, then the trouble would be over?

Mr. RANSDALL. Does the Senator think that as a result of his amendment, should it be agreed to, that the differences between the spot and the future markets would become practically the same and that we would have in the futures market substantially the same differences as in the spot market?

Mr. COMER. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. RANSDALL. Suppose that should be the result; I ask the Senator if that would not so restrict the market that dealers would not invest in these future contracts? Would it not contract and narrow it in such a manner that people would not deal in futures, and therefore the Senator would lose the very insurance that he is seeking to secure?

In other words, he would kill the goose that lays the golden egg which seems so important to his mills. The Senator finds that he must have an insurance and an insurance medium. The exchanges are the insurance medium. If he so narrows the contract as to restrict and tie the hands of the people who wish to gamble, if you please, or to speculate, who buy contracts from time to time on the market, will they not be prevented from taking the risk of underwriting the insurance or guaranty the Senator finds so important and essential to his business prosperity?

Mr. COMER. The only business that will be restricted is the gambler who insists on a market allowing marked cards, loaded dice, with which the game is to be played. That is the man we are trying to get rid of, but it will certainly help legitimate trading. In other words, it will multiply the business men who will want to insure their business by legitimate hedging.

Mr. RANSDALL. I should like to assure the Senator that if he can convince me that the cards are marked or the dice loaded, I shall be delighted to assist him in enacting any law that will prevent such dealings, for I certainly have no more in common with transactions of that sort than he has. However, I believe the Senate ought to be assured that in attempting to eradicate this alleged unconscionable system of trading that it does not deliver a death blow to legitimate and necessary business on the exchanges, which, according to the committee report on the cotton-futures act, stand as "the only buffer between the helpless producer and the powerful buyer of his product"—the spinner.

Mr. COMER. Convince you? Here you are, sir. We sold, if you remember, 200 bales in New York. This was delivered through Carpenter & Co.; nice people. They did not buy the cotton. They were simply our brokers, our commission house. They took up for us 100 bales of cotton in New York, and here is what they took: Six bales of strict low middling, 11 bales of low middling, 22 bales of strict good ordinary, 3 bales of good ordinary, 4 bales of strict middling tinge yellow, 14 bales middling tinge, 31 bales of strict low middling tinge, 14 bales low middling tinge, 1 bale of middling stains yellow, 1 bale of strict middling stains blue, and 2 bales of middling stains blue. That makes 109 bales. What do you think of that kind of a delivery?

I will show you the sequence of that transaction. We both wrote and wired them to sell that cotton, that we could not use it, but they could neither sell nor exchange it.

We telegraphed them:

Please see if you can get offer to exchange the 109 bales spots for all white cotton, say, average middling; nothing below strict low middling.

They wired back:

Premium on white cotton probably 5 to 6 cents over July. Trying to get offer of some kind on your contract.

We wired them:

Want to know if you can exchange the 106 bales spots for all white cotton; nothing below strict low middling, and at what difference.

They replied:

Impossible to exchange your contract for white cotton.

Then we wired them:

Is there no spot dealer willing to make the exchange at a price? Would appreciate effort to get offer.

Here is what they answered:

No one willing to make such an exchange. Best thing to do deliver hundred six bales on contract and buy hundred bales of spots in open market.

"The best thing you can do is to sell contract and redeliver 106 bales of spot cotton." That is what Carpenter & Co. advised, and that is what we did. The above game was played with loaded dice.

Mr. RANSDALL. Mr. President, my only observation on that is that I know nothing whatever about the transaction to which the Senator alludes, but there is a possibility of unfairness and injustice being practiced under the terms of virtually every law. No matter how legislation may attempt to prohibit these practices in the business transactions of the world some men will conduct them in a way not equitable to all parties concerned.

As the Senator read that list, some of those bales of cotton were not deliverable under the contract. Some of them were below low middling. They actually tried to deliver some cotton which could not be delivered, which was not tenderable.

Mr. COMER. That was before the last Smith-Lever Act amendment.

Mr. RANSDALL. Perhaps so. Then good ordinary was deliverable at that time.

Mr. COMER. I have given this to you straight from the bat, and it is not business and should be unlawful. Even under the amended law the Bureau of Markets makes the exchange

prices by compositing prices as described from 10 spot markets. Think of getting reliable daily prices from 10 spot markets on 10 different types of cotton. It is absolute nonsense. It is like the new way they measure the distance to the fixed stars, as I said the other day. They guess one-fourth of the distance and multiply it by 4. When the Bureau of Markets attempts to make a basis price, or composite price, from 10 spot markets on 10 different grades it is nonsense.

Mr. RANSDELL. How ought they to do it?

Mr. COMER. I am going to ask the secretary of the Bureau of Markets to limit to five. It ought not to be over four. The fact of the business is, it ought to be delivered on the commercial price, spot price; if we are tendering on a basis price, basis price should be middling of the market and not a factitious middling. It is too contemptible to think of.

Then you talk about exchange deliveries. There is a great deal said about getting cotton from the exchanges. I have spoken here as earnestly as I knew how and made it as clear as I possibly could that cotton does not come from the exchanges. The exchange is simply an index of the price, yet we have men of fine sense who will gravely argue with you that if you put this amendment in it will be impossible for them to deliver the cotton. The exchange propaganda gravely asserts this, and they know it is moonshine of the flimsiest character.

I will tell you how much cotton New York has had certificated this year—it sold millions of bales of contracts. It certificated 7,676 bales, and yet they will gravely assert that cotton is delivered through the exchanges. There is not one of them that does not know it is not true.

Spot cotton is not bought through the exchange. A future contract is a hedge against the market, and you go where the cotton is to buy it, and you buy the spot cotton at the market price. The exchange does not make the price. It can not make the price, and it has no right to try to make value. The exchanges are going out and saying abroad in the land, "Pass this law and you outlaw a whole lot of low-grade cotton and cause thousands of people to suffer." That is the sheerest nonsense, and they know it. It does not inlaw nor outlaw any cotton. When a man gets up and gravely asserts that it is the spinners' contract, and against low-grade cotton, that man ought to have his head examined; that is, if he is a business man. It is not true, and it can not be true.

You heard the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] say a while ago that cotton was bought and sold on the basis of supply and demand. That is true. That is the only market for cotton, and it is the only market for anything.

Mr. RANSDELL. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. COMER. Certainly.

Mr. RANSDELL. The Senator, as I understand, says that when anyone asserts that it is a spinners' contract he ought to have his head examined.

Mr. COMER. Surely.

Mr. RANSDELL. I have not made that assertion, and so, of course, I know the Senator has not applied the remark to me.

Mr. COMER. I am not applying anything to the Senator.

Mr. RANSDELL. But the assertion was made in a number of the letters and telegrams which I read several days ago. Now, I want to call the Senator's attention merely to the headlines of the Montgomery Journal of Saturday, April 10:

Senator COMER's speech before the Senate April 3, 1920, amending the cotton-futures act, stabilizing futures values and making them approximate commercial value, discouraging violent speculations and erratic differences between contract market and spot cotton.

Senator GRONNA, who is chairman of the conference committee, in questioning Senator COMER, declared that the decision in conference will depend entirely upon the Representatives from the cotton States.

The question is, Will they favor the farmer or listen to the exchange gamblers' propaganda?
Farmers and others interested should take immediate action.

The article seems to occupy five and a little over one-half columns—practically a whole page—of the Montgomery Journal of April 10, and at the bottom I see the word "Advertisement."

I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama, without intending to be personal in the least, if that speech of his was paid for by the producers, by the cotton exchanges, or by the spinners, and in whose interest that advertisement was inserted in the Montgomery Journal?

Mr. COMER rose.

Mr. RANSDELL. If the Senator wishes, I will make one question of the whole, as I have two or three other similar articles here.

I will now read from the Montgomery Advertiser of Friday, April 16. The headline is:

Paper by B. B. COMER read before the convention of the American Cotton Association.

It occupies nearly three and a quarter columns. At the bottom it is marked "Advertisement," and purports to be an address by the Senator from Alabama, which was read before the convention of the American Cotton Association in Montgomery, Ala.

I read next from the "State," of Columbia, S. C., of Thursday morning, April 29, 1920, as follows:

SENATOR COMER'S SPEECH BEFORE THE SENATE, APRIL 17, 1920.

Senator COMER's speech before the Senate, April 17, going very thoroughly into every objection to his proposed amendment to the cotton-futures act—trying to stabilize contract cotton with spot cotton, making the contracts more truly represent spot values—he shows that the cotton exchanges are trying to reach and prejudice Members of Congress by propaganda telegrams from various interests incited by them endeavoring by every possible means to maintain their speculative advantages by which they have gerrymandered the price of cotton for years, gathering unwarranted gains. The exchange propaganda makes all kinds of absurd statements, dogmatic and impossible of proof; using every effort to create prejudice between producer, dealer, and spinner; holding themselves up as the guardian of the farmer and trying to make the laws governing their relation to the handling of this greatest of world products. Farmers, legitimate dealers, take notice. The issue is the gamblers' interest against yours. The exchanges are using every method to control your representatives. Will you be idle?

Those are the headlines, in large letters, at the head of this article, which occupies all of one page of the "State," Columbia, S. C., of the 29th of April, except a fraction over one-half column. At the end of it is printed the word "Advertisement."

Now, I again ask the Senator whether these three advertisements—and I presume others, for I have understood that similar advertisements were published in the papers of other States as well as those of Alabama and South Carolina—were paid for by the spinners or by the cotton producers or by the cotton exchanges, and if so, what was the purpose? Whom have the producers got to meet in this propaganda?

Mr. COMER. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Louisiana has called attention to this matter. The Senator has not all of the papers in which this publication was made?

Mr. RANSDELL. No; there are several others, I think, but I have not the papers here.

Mr. COMER. We are trying to have similar articles published in Dallas; in Oklahoma; in Little Rock; Memphis; Atlanta; Macon; Raleigh; Greensboro, N. C.; Greenville, S. C.; and Columbia, S. C.

I will state further that last year we ourselves made the propaganda, and we published articles in the papers of Georgia, Alabama, South Carolina, and North Carolina. That is one reason why those States to-day know what they are doing; that is why they realize the situation. We did not publish articles in Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Texas and other States, and that is one reason that the people in those States are not acquainted with the issue. If we had gone to those States last year and showed the conditions as they were, then we would not now have so much trouble.

Mr. RANSDELL rose.

Mr. COMER. The Senator will wait a moment, if he please—

Mr. RANSDELL. Certainly.

Mr. COMER. That was last year. This year we paid for the publication of the matter.

Mr. SHEPPARD. To whom does the Senator refer when he says "we"?

Mr. COMER. The Avondale mills.

Mr. RANSDELL. The Senator means his own mills?

Mr. COMER. I mean our own mills. Not one dollar was collected anywhere else.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator means there were no other contributors?

Mr. COMER. I will say to the Senator that I mean we conducted the whole thing. If we get a stabilized contract it will be worth a very great deal not only to our mills but to everybody with whom we have business. As regards my own feeling about such matters it is different from that entertained by some others.

I made a fight in Alabama for a better freight rate, for better conditions for the people who live and labor in the State, to change it from a reactionary State and make it a progressive State. I have spent 10 years of my own time and \$50,000 of my own money to do that. I thought it was a service well rendered, and I shall never regret a day of the time or a dollar of the money expended, nor shall I regret the effort I have made if this amendment shall be carried through, taking care as it does of every man who raises cotton, of every man who deals in cotton, or who manufactures cotton. That is the ultimate object of the amendment, and I do not care who he is who asserts to the contrary, he does not know what he is talking about.

Of course, that is the object of the amendment. From whom does the cotton mill buy the cotton? From the dealer. From whom does the dealer buy it? From the producer. When the cotton exchanges send out their propaganda to arouse prejudice against those people, why are they doing it, and what for? Is it to help the farmer, to help the dealer? They never work for those causes.

Mr. RANSDALL. May I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. COMER. Certainly.

Mr. RANSDALL. The Senator just stated that he carried on this propaganda last year and this year in North Carolina and South Carolina and hence the people of those States were educated.

Mr. COMER. I forgot to say that we did not get into North Carolina very much, but we got in there to some extent.

Mr. RANSDALL. You got into South Carolina?

Mr. COMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANSDALL. The Senator certainly had the advertisement in a Little Rock paper, in North Carolina papers, and in South Carolina papers; and yet the States that voted against his amendment at the great cotton convention in Montgomery, Ala., a short time ago were Arkansas, Louisiana, North Carolina, Mississippi, and South Carolina. So certainly those States which were educated by the Senator's articles did not go with him on that vote.

Mr. COMER. The president of that convention was Mr. Wannamaker. The first telegram I published in the RECORD in regard to this matter was from Mr. Wannamaker at the very beginning of this controversy, strongly favoring the amendment, standing for it, and wishing it success. That telegram is published in the RECORD and Senators can read it for themselves.

Mr. Wannamaker voted against the amendment at the Montgomery convention. Why did he vote against it? Because he said he did not want politics brought into a cotton convention; that is why. The day I received the telegram that the cotton convention had voted 15 to 16, I read the names of the States voting, and I asked the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL], "Is not South Carolina for the amendment?" He said, "It certainly is"; and to-day I understand that every Representative from South Carolina stands for it. By the way, I promised to read a letter concerning that convention.

Mr. RANSDALL. I will be very glad to hear it.

Mr. COMER. It is from ex-Senator White. The Senator, I think, knows who he is.

Mr. RANSDALL. I know him very well.

Mr. COMER. He is one of the nicest men I ever saw.

Mr. RANSDALL. He is a fine man.

Mr. COMER. And one of the fairest men I ever knew. He was a representative at that convention. By the way, he is a candidate to succeed the late Senator Bankhead, and a better man could not be elected.

Reading Senator White's letter:

We had a very stubborn, and, I am inclined to think, unscrupulous opposition—

Does the Senator from Louisiana hear that?

Mr. RANSDALL. Yes.

Mr. COMER. I repeat:

We had a very stubborn, and, I am inclined to think, unscrupulous opposition. The resolution indorsing the amendment was referred to the committee on resolutions, which was stopped against us. The committee lost the resolution—

He means they lost the paper—

When we learned this we got the legislative enactment committee to originate an indorsement of the amendment. Had a favorable report to the board of directors, then had the board of directors indorse it, which was accomplished with difficulty. We finally had a test vote, then on a recount we got one majority—

On a recount, on the test vote, there was one vote counted against it that did not belong there, and on the matter being called to the attention of the chair the question was brought back and carried in favor of the resolution—

After this action was obtained the resolution committee found the resolution and put in a report referring it to a committee to investigate and report at the next session of the association; this meant to chloroform it. When the committee reported I moved to amend it on the floor of the convention by inserting an indorsement of your resolution, the chairman saying that the matter would be acted on in a few minutes by the board of directors, and that then it would come up in the convention. When the board of directors reported they chloroformed it by referring it to the committee for investigation.

Did the Senator from Louisiana ever hear of that kind of procedure?

Mr. RANSDALL. I have heard of such things happening.

Mr. COMER. It does not sound like the report the Senator read the other day, does it?

I moved to amend the report by indorsing the amendment, after two or three hours' fight on the floor, in which Col. Thompson, ex-president of the New Orleans Exchange, urged that the matter be postponed, saying it would injure the association.

Mr. RANSDALL. May I ask the Senator if he wishes to pursue that line further, or shall I ask him a further question now in regard to these articles?

Mr. COMER. I want to explain them further.

Mr. RANSDALL. All right; I will not bother the Senator.

Mr. COMER. I did not answer you enough on that.

Mr. RANSDALL. I shall ask my question later, then.

Mr. COMER. Senator, I differ, I believe, with some folks on those things. Whenever I was trying to serve the public, it was not a question of expense. It was a question of whether or not service could be rendered; and if it took ten times what it cost to make this fight before the people, if they would understand, we would think it money well spent. I am one of those who do not believe that everybody has to be selfish all the time, and in reciting these facts to you, they are not dogmatic. There is no dogmatic assertion. Everything, every single, solitary thing, that I assert I can prove. What I am stating here is the result of actual experience in the proposition. I am giving you experience. I am not giving you dogmatic assertions, or propaganda, or anything of that kind.

Mr. RANSDALL. Mr. President, would the Senator mind saying how much he has expended on this propaganda? It must have cost a great deal.

Mr. COMER. How much would you think, Senator?

Mr. RANSDALL. I should think a good many thousands of dollars. If I should insert an advertisement taking up a whole page of a big daily paper, I would expect to pay a large sum of money for it. I imagine you must have spent a good many thousands of dollars.

Mr. COMER. Senator, there is this difference: When you insert anything, that is a political advertisement. This is a commercial advertisement, you understand. They are two different propositions.

Mr. RANSDALL. Perhaps so.

Mr. COMER. Anybody can see that it is a commercial advertisement. Anybody can see that this does not redound to my benefit, you understand. It is to work out a principle, for the protection of what? That thing that we ought to have had years ago—the protection of the cotton of the South, the cotton business of the world.

Mr. RANSDALL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit another question at this time? I believe the Senator agrees with me that the Baltimore Manufacturers' Record is a fair index of conditions in the South, and usually is an impartial paper, is it not?

Mr. COMER. I should think so.

Mr. RANSDALL. Has it not been a great champion of the South, especially the cotton industry of the South, for many years?

Mr. COMER. I think so.

Mr. RANSDALL. I find on page 79 of the Baltimore Manufacturers' Record for the 29th of April this statement:

ENORMOUS PROFITS OF SOUTHERN COTTON MILLS.

The Tucpau Mills, of Spartanburg, S. C., one of the big cotton manufacturers of the South, has just declared a stock dividend of 303 per cent, and the Spartanburg Herald reports that \$850 a share was bid for the stock of this company. The Easley Mills, of Easley, S. C., has also declared a stock dividend of 300 per cent, payable in preferred stock, yielding 7 per cent a year. The Saxon Mills has declared a stock dividend of 100 per cent, and other mills are reported as likely to declare large stock dividends.

While the amazing prosperity of the cotton-mill industry is adding enormously to the wealth of the South, these great dividends show that the cotton mills could have paid a much higher price for cotton and still have earned enormous profits. Unquestionably, the cotton producers have not had a fair division of this prosperity.

Now, I want to ask the Senator—and if it is not a fair question I will withdraw it—if the Alabama mills have made profits in the same proportion as the South Carolina mills, and if the cotton producers of Alabama have reaped anything like the same proportion of profits that the cotton mills of Alabama have realized?

Mr. COMER. In answer to your question, Senator, I think the cotton mills everywhere have been prosperous. Referring to one of the great items that you mention there, however—the dividends declared—I wish to say that if you take a mill of 100,000 spindles erected three years ago the increase in the cost of that mill to-day is 300 per cent.

It costs four times as much to build a mill now as it used to. For the last mill we put up we paid \$1.58 a spindle; to-day the price is \$6.50 a spindle. The last cards we put up was \$400 a card, and to-day the price is \$1,400 a card; and if you happen to have any of that property the increment of increased value puts the per cent up; of course it does.

Then, besides that, you take construction: The first mill we built cost \$4.50 per thousand for brick; to-day the price of brick is \$20 per thousand. The price of lumber was \$9 a thousand; the price now is around \$80 a thousand. Those things are going along. But, Senator, I am not talking about the prosperity of the exchanges. We want the exchanges to be prosperous and we want the cotton mills to be prosperous. We want the exchanges to stabilize; to let the law of supply and demand indicate value—the value of commerce—and not a factitious and fictitious value. That is what we want. We do not begrudge them any earnings whatever. We do not care what they earn; we want to see the whole country prosperous—not one section, but every section.

Mr. RANSDALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COMER. Certainly.

Mr. RANSDALL. I want to say to the Senator that I am delighted that these mills have made a big profit. I hope his mills made as big a profit in proportion as these South Carolina mills. My only regret is that the cotton growers did not make much profit. I know I did not. I certainly did not pay any income tax on my cotton crop last year.

The cotton convention which we have talked about so much passed a resolution saying—and that was unanimous, Senator; I do not think there was any dissent on that—that, while they would not attempt to specify any price for cotton, the cotton mills could well afford to pay 60 cents a pound for it instead of present prices, considering the enormous profits they have made. Now, it seems to me in all of this discussion that we ought to look a little after the producing end of this proposition as well as the spinning end.

I am standing here in my humble way not only to defend the Cotton Exchange of New Orleans, but particularly that great industry in which I myself am engaged, the production of cotton. It is my only business. As I said several days ago in speaking here, I am not connected with the exchange. I live more than 300 miles from New Orleans, and rarely get there. I have not been on the floor of the exchange in years, but I am tremendously interested in the production end of the cotton industry; and when I see the statement made by representative conventions that the cotton mills could afford to pay 60 cents a pound, and when I read to the Senator a statement published in this great journal that three mills of South Carolina declared stock dividends of over 300 per cent last year, and then the Senator goes on and talks to me about the evils of the exchange, I can not help thinking that the Senator ought to explain somewhat why those mills were making that enormous per cent in this day of the high cost of living, at this time when there is so much talk about profiteering, when somebody has recently inaugurated a scheme to add further profits to the cotton mills by persuading everybody to use overalls, when everyone knows overalls are made of cotton. Of course, I know the Senator did not do anything of that kind, and I do not charge that it was done in the interest of the cotton mills, but it certainly is one of the direct results of that program. If everybody wears overalls, there will be more demand for cotton products.

Mr. COMER. All goods that are sold, Senator, even cotton goods, even overalls, are sold in the world's market on the basis of supply and demand, and the cotton mills have been doing the same thing. That is exactly what they want the exchanges to do. We want them on the supply and demand market, the world market. That is what we want. There is nothing else to it than that.

Now, to prove to the satisfaction of everybody that the exchanges do not deliver cotton, that they were never intended to deliver cotton, and the falsity of all this stuff to the effect that if you pass this amendment then the exchanges will be knocked sky-high, because they can not get the cotton to deliver—that is what they say—I am going to read you, Senator, the amount of cotton certificated in New York this year on the New York Cotton Exchange.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question there?

Mr. COMER. Certainly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you mean by "certified" sold through the exchange?

Mr. COMER. No; that was turned in for sale.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Was it sold?

Mr. COMER. Some of it was. Some of it was delivered. You know they had a squeeze in March, Senator. They were selling cotton the last of February at 36.52.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Who turned that in, and how did they get it?

Mr. COMER. Oh, they bought it on the markets of the world. You buy it anywhere. That is where you get cotton, on the markets.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you mean that the members of the exchange bought it?

Mr. COMER. I do not mean the members of the exchange. Anybody can sell cotton on the exchange, but you have got to have it there to deliver, provided you want it delivered. Most of them do not calculate on delivery.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does some committee on the exchange do the certifying?

Mr. COMER. Oh, no; the Government does. It has to be seven-eighths of an inch staple, a certain color, and so forth. The Government does that. We bought cotton some years ago, 2,000 bales; we paid for the tender in the spring, and it was delivered to us in August. That was the time when they found this indictment against Patton, Haynes, Brown, and others. The total cotton certificated in New York in January was 2,336 bales; in February it was 666 bales; in March, 3,090 bales; in April, 1,584 bales. A total of 7,676 bales certificated for delivery. That was in New York.

I believe you read the other day, Senator, that New Orleans had 20,744 bales.

Mr. RANSDALL. I think you are correct, 20,744 bales.

Mr. COMER. Of which 15,920 are higher grade cotton.

Mr. RANSDALL. That is correct.

Mr. COMER. I want you to keep that right square in your mind.

Mr. RANSDALL. Very well.

Mr. COMER. Senator, last week we had 200 bales delivered to us through the New Orleans Exchange. We were carrying quite a bit of cotton. We did not believe they would tender, but they did tender 200 bales, and here is what they delivered. You recollect saying that two-thirds of the cotton down there was high grade. They delivered to us of the 200 bales—there were 210 bales, because of the light weight—strict good middling, 1 bale; good middling, 5 bales; strict middling, 1 bale; middling, 1 bale. That was the high-grade cotton out of that 15,000 bales they delivered. Then strict middling tinges, 3 bales; low middling, 199 bales. That made 210 bales. They gave us 8 bales of high grade, 3 bales of tinges, and 199 bales of the lowest grades. They did not disturb their higher grade cotton.

Mr. RANSDALL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. COMER. Certainly.

Mr. RANSDALL. Will the Senator please tell us how much difference they allowed him between the values of those low grades they tendered and middling cotton on those dates?

Mr. COMER. Yes, sir; and there is where the trouble comes in, too. I am glad you asked the question. I have the comparative differences—New Orleans and New York. I am loaded for bear to-day.

This is from the Bureau of Markets. The exchange difference in New Orleans is now 9 cents between low middling and middling. The difference between middling and low middling in New York is 7.20. There is a difference of 1½ cents between low middling in New York and low middling in New Orleans. Who ever heard of a condition like that being fair? One and three-quarters cents between the prices, according to this, of New York and New Orleans on low middling. Not only that but worse than that, because New York Exchange middling is a cent higher than New Orleans, which makes 2½ cents difference; and, Senator, you agree to this amendment and that thing will be impossible, and it ought to be impossible.

Mr. RANSDALL. Mr. President, will the Senator answer my question?

Mr. COMER. Anything.

Mr. RANSDALL. The Senator has not answered my question yet.

Mr. COMER. What is it?

Mr. RANSDALL. I have asked the Senator what difference was allowed him by the company which tendered him these low grades of cotton of which he complains. What was paid him in the way of a difference between middling, the basis of the contract, and the cotton which they actually tendered to him?

Mr. COMER. Senator, I have just told you. I told you 9 cents in New Orleans.

Mr. RANSDALL. The Senator spoke of just one grade there. He said those were the differences between New Orleans and New York. But he has never yet said whether it was a New York contract or a New Orleans contract, and I can not tell from his statement what they did actually pay him, and whether the difference was a fair one or not. If the Senator received the full amount of money due him, I take it he certainly has no complaint to make. Was the Senator swindled in the transaction?

Was the matter negotiated so that the Senator actually lost money on his contract?

Mr. COMER. When 39.80 was the price in New Orleans, and we got the low middling at 9 cents off, that would make it 30.80 in the New Orleans exchange market for the low middling. That low-middling cotton was worth that price anywhere. The man who put that cotton through the exchange lost money. But that is not the question. It was the basis, which was 39.80, as against a spot price 2 cents higher. If the exchanges had been functioning and the differentials between low middling and middling had been the same, 9 cents, then the seller of the cotton would have gotten 2 cents a pound more and that is wherein the exchange basis price middling operates against the holders of off-grade cotton as compared with a stabilized price middling.

Mr. RANSDALL. I am trying to find out what Senator COMER and his mills lost on the transaction.

Mr. COMER. I have just read that we took 199 bales of low-middling cotton. That was the lowest grade they have. If we were getting it for higher grade mills, we would have had to resell it, because we could not use it. If we were taking it for our low-grade mills, it was cheaper than we could have bought it, as low middling was worth that price or more anywhere. I mean that it had no added value by having come to us through an exchange and had lost money because of the expense of delivery.

Mr. RANSDALL. But how much money did the Senator lose?

Mr. COMER. I do not know. We had bought this contract months before at a price of about 33½ cents. The cotton was closed out at 39.67; we made 6 cents per pound on the hedge sale and got the cotton cheaper than we could have bought it on the market.

Mr. RANSDALL. If the Senator does not know, Mr. President, I am sure I do not.

Mr. COMER. On April 19 strict good middling was quoted 275 points on middling in Memphis, 400 on at New Orleans, 288 on at New York; good middling was 200 points on in Memphis, 350 on in New Orleans, and 223 on in New York; strict middling yellow tinge was quoted 450 off in Memphis, 150 off in New Orleans, 315 off in New York; good middling yellow tinge was quoted 300 off in Memphis, 75 on in New Orleans, and 133 off in New York; and good middling yellow stains was 600 off in Memphis, 300 off in New Orleans, and 450 off in New York. I give these differences to show you that these can not be true quotations; they are fictitious, and yet out of them is composed the basis middling.

Mr. RANSDALL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if Memphis is an exchange market?

Mr. COMER. Sure.

Mr. RANSDALL. They have not a cotton exchange there, have they?

Mr. COMER. It is one of the markets from which we get prices. I think they have a cotton exchange there; I am sure of it.

Mr. RANSDALL. I was not aware of it. I thought there was only one big cotton exchange in the South, at New Orleans, and one at New York—two in the United States. That is my understanding.

Mr. COMER. You are wrong, because we have a letter from the Dallas exchange. Nearly all the big cotton markets have exchanges. But I am quoting you from the spot market, from which New York and New Orleans get their relations.

Mr. RANSDALL. I do not want to be misunderstood. I know they have a spot market in Memphis and these other big cities; but what I meant was that there is no future-contract market exchange in Memphis.

Mr. COMER. I think they have.

Mr. RANSDALL. Perhaps so. I understood the contrary.

Mr. COMER. They have what they call bucket shops.

I have here a telegram from New Orleans sent a few days ago to one of their correspondents in Alabama. It reads:

NEW ORLEANS.

Professional effort being made to depress the market, but offerings absorbed in good fashion. Likely require constant selling to force market down to any considerable amount.

Here is another telegram:

NEW ORLEANS.

Rumored there will be about 10,000 bales of low-grade cotton delivered on May contracts here to-day.

Spots New Orleans reported quiet, if any change likely lower. Not much business so far. Reported movement in New York to close the New York Cotton Exchange on Saturday in the future.

That was dated last week.

You yourself said that they only had 5,000 bales of low-grade cotton there, and yet here is a telegram from New Orleans that they are going to tender 10,000 bales.

Mr. RANSDALL. Mr. President, the Senator does not mean to misquote me, I am sure. He says I myself said they only had 5,000 bales. What I said is found on page 6345 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the 30th of April, and it speaks for itself. I said that the United States Bureau of Markets showed that cotton classified and certificated from March, 1919, to December 1, 1919, in the New Orleans Exchange market was 20,744 bales, of which 4,824 were low grade. I did not say they did not have a great deal more cotton there. I assume that in that enormous cotton market, which handles hundreds of thousands of bales of spots—and I could not pretend to say how many bales of futures—there are bound to be a good many more than 5,000 bales of low-grade cotton.

Mr. COMER. The way those things are managed largely is to keep them in near-by warehouses, ready to be certificated. Where New York has less than 3,000 bales, I understand that Norfolk has 70,000 bales. Suppose Norfolk was carrying this kind of cotton. That is the way those things are run. In your speech on page 6344 of the RECORD you practically make the spot market run with futures market, both running very nearly the same thing.

And, Senator, that is just exactly what we are after. I want the two to run together. They should run together, and when they do not run together they are not functioning. That is what is the trouble. The New York Exchange market and the spot market in the South have been for the last 60 days very nearly together, the thing we are after; the New York market is functioning properly.

I have here an article which some gentleman sent me, some Senator, I suppose, cut from the New York Commercial of Friday, April 23. This article from the Wall Street Journal I am going to read you says:

Kill this rider.

Mr. RANSDALL. Alluding to your amendment.

Mr. COMER. Yes. "Kill this rider."

What endless litigation is in this vague wording.

The vagueness here charged against the amendment has been eliminated by the amendment already offered.

Then, the impossibility of performance. There are now 2,262 bales of certified cotton in New York—

This is April 1, from the Wall Street Journal—

None is middling fair; 4 bales are strict good middling, 46 good, 146 strict middling, and 477 middling—altogether 27 per cent of the total amount here. But the unhappy seller must deliver 50 per cent of these grades. How easy to create a squeeze!

But the planter will be the chief sufferer—

Those blessed planters, you know, how they do favor them!

because about 40 per cent of his cotton will be outlawed. Cotton, even from the same plantation, is of different lengths, color, and quality. Until interfered with by law, the exchange made all spinnable cotton good for delivery on a contract. Thus the planter had a market for every bale of his cotton that was usable in the mills.

That man, Senators, did not know what he was writing about. He did not understand the first gist of the question at all, and even the Times-Picayune did not understand. They did not understand a single gist of the amendment. I have two letters from parties in Louisiana calling attention to that.

From the New York Commercial I read further:

The sooner Mr. COMER learns that the interests of the cotton merchant and the cotton grower are identical the sooner will he withdraw from any plan which is bound to work great hardships upon growers and merchants alike.

That man does not know what he is talking about.

"The contract market has two purposes," declared C. T. Revere, of Munds, Rogers & Stackpole, in discussing the Comer amendment. "First, it is an outlet for such merchantable and spinnable cotton as may be unsalable at a given time, and, second, it affords price insurance against market fluctuations. Hedge purchases by merchants against sales of the staple to spinners as well as hedge sales by merchants against accumulations afford insurance to be obtained in no other way."

That is from the papers. I want to read a letter from a cotton man, one of the largest in Alabama, straight as a shingle:

SELMA, ALA., April 20, 1920.

HON. B. B. COMER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to commend you in your effort to amend the law that will give to the cotton trade a just and fair contract on the cotton exchanges.

For years we have longed for a contract that would afford us a reasonable hedge. As you are aware, spot cotton is frequently offered for sale when buyers can not in turn make an actual sale; under such circumstances we as buyers would be glad to buy the cotton if we could get a hedge on the cotton exchanges that would be reasonably safe. Thus you will see the benefit that would arise in favor of the producer. He could always find a purchaser for his cotton. With conditions as have prevailed during the near past how could a buyer buy spots at, say, 40 cents and sell a future contract as a hedge at a discount of something like \$25 a bale?

If we can be of any service to you, do not hesitate to call on us.

Yours, very truly,

W. P. WELCH & CO.

There is a spot man; I mean a man of actual business, a man who comes in contact with it every day, who says it is a great help to him in the business. He says it will help every farmer he comes in contact with. He can go ahead and sell anything and hedge; he can go ahead and buy and hedge, and his statements are all straight, and show business ability and comprehension of the subject.

Mr. RANSDELL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COMER. Yes.

Mr. RANSDELL. Is that gentleman to whom you have just alluded a cotton producer?

Mr. COMER. I do not know.

Mr. RANSDELL. The Senator does not know whether he is raising cotton or not?

Mr. COMER. No.

Mr. RANSDELL. So far as the Senator knows, he may be a spinner?

Mr. COMER. No; he is not a spinner.

Mr. RANSDELL. He may be a dealer in cotton?

Mr. COMER. He is a dealer in cotton.

Mr. RANSDELL. I have in my hand, if the Senator will permit me to read it, a letter, dated April 22, from President J. A. Whitehurst, of the State Board of Agriculture of Oklahoma—

Mr. COMER. Read it in your own time to-morrow.

Mr. RANSDELL. Very well. I will not interfere with the Senator.

Mr. COMER. Here is a man that we buy thousands of bales of cotton from:

SELMA, ALA., April 6, 1920.

Hon. B. B. COMER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Have wired petition to Hon. E. D. SMITH and GORDON LEE signed by prominent farmers, bankers, and merchants urging passage of the Comer cotton bill. Hope you will succeed in passing this meritorious bill, as it will, no doubt, be of great benefit to the producer and consumer and put the future trading on a more legitimate basis.

MORRIS HOHENBERG.

That is from way down in southern Alabama.

I am not printing all these in the RECORD. Here is a telegram I have to-day:

WAYCROSS, GA., May 1, 1920.

Senator B. B. COMER,
Washington, D. C.:

The Ware County Farmers' Union, in session, with the Satilla, Pine Grove, Mount Green, Waresboro, Lynn locals represented, indorses the Comer amendment and urges its enactment into law.

L. C. WALKER, President.
J. M. SOLOMON, Secretary.

I want to read this from the New York Commercial. This man says:

It is a spinners' bill—

He is a member of the cotton exchange—

for the benefit of the spinners, and that benefit will accrue at the expense of the man who grows cotton.

To appreciate how much of a spinners' bill this is it should be understood that low-grade cotton is far more expensive to make into fabric than is the high-grade staple.

This is the story:

Labor in the mills is largely on piecework basis. A worker can not handle low-grade material so rapidly as he can the high grade, consequently there is dissatisfaction among the workers when too large a percentage of the staple is of the lower grades. As the workers' output and pay is reduced by the low grades so the output of the mill is reduced.

That gives a very clear statement of why the mills are demanding and buying at the higher prices the high grades, and not demanding and buying at the lower prices the low grades. That is a very clear statement of it. I could not have done it better, and this is from a man who is writing against the amendment.

Under these conditions it at once becomes clear—

Of course it is clear—

why the spinner wants high-grade cotton, particularly at the present, when the demand for strictly high-grade cloths is larger than ever. The Comer amendment would make for just this condition which the spinners want. It would force the delivery of high-grade raw materials to the tremendous disadvantage of the grower whose crop can not be all strictly high grade.

That latter part is just immaculate nonsense, and I am sorry he did not know it. The high grade is made by the demand for it and the low grade is made by the demand for it, and this does not add one picayune to it either way, and the man who asserts it, as I said this afternoon, should have his head examined.

He says this about me:

He sends out telegrams about a mythical order for 5,000,000 bales of cotton from Europe waiting to be placed, if the cotton can be had, and tells the growers they can get 60 cents a pound for their cotton.

I never was accused of that before. I would never say to anybody that you could send your cotton anywhere and get

more than the market price for it. When you talk about sending 5,000,000 bales of low-grade cotton anywhere, it will be done at great risk. It is the market that makes the price.

Spinners are going to send representatives where? To Europe. For what purpose? To see the spinners to sell this cotton or any other cotton at the market price.

I want to call attention to this article again:

Reverting to the Comer amendment, I want to call your attention particularly to the fact that of the last crop 57 per cent was graded middling or above—

Fifty-seven per cent, and yet they have balked like the mischief when I said the average of cotton was two-thirds of the crop above, and this says that of the last crop 57 per cent was graded middling or above, and then says—

leaving 43 per cent which could not be delivered on contract. Who would take it? That is a question which the southern cotton grower must answer.

There is an everlasting answer to that. Supply and demand will take care of it just like it always has and always will do, and if every bale of it was tenderable through the exchanges it would not facilitate the sale or value a cent, and any assertion to the contrary of this would make the exchanges capable of making a flat price on cotton.

Mr. RANSDELL. I should like to ask the Senator what is going to happen to the low-grade cotton of the South—and he admits there is a great amount of it in the South now—if his amendment is adopted? What is going to happen to all these low grades, and will they not lose their availability as an insurance for the seller and their potentiality for hedging purposes? I would like to have the Senator from Alabama explain exactly the effect of his amendment on the producer's low-grade cotton, which makes up such a large portion of his crop.

Mr. COMER. The stabilizing of the contract price making it approximate the spot price will unquestionably advance the contract price, and if the same parity between the lower grades will continue, then the lower grades to that extent will be benefited and they will also be benefited to the extent that the market reflects solvent, trustworthy business conditions.

Mr. RANSDELL. May I ask the Senator whether he thinks that we ought to repeal the cotton-futures law entirely?

Mr. COMER. No.

Mr. RANSDELL. Does the Senator believe the exchanges, properly handled, exercise a good function and one valuable to commerce and business generally?

Mr. COMER. Not only that, but I believe they will be a benefit when you make them straight and honest, when you get a business that is straight, that dealers will go there and do business more so than they will do to-day. I believe it will increase business.

Mr. RANSDELL. But the Senator thinks that men like our friend ex-Senator Percy, Mr. A. B. Learned, W. B. Thompson, and others, whom I quoted extensively, are mistaken when they say the law is functioning very well? Does the Senator think it will be very much of a benefit to the entire cotton trade if the amendment which he has proposed is adopted?

Mr. COMER. When you get back to Senator Percy, I want to explain what I said about gambling a while ago. Senator Percy is one of the nicest men I ever saw and I am very fond of him. He is not a gambler, you understand, not by any manner of means.

Mr. RANSDELL. I am very glad to have the Senator withdraw that statement. I knew that Le Roy Percy was no gambler.

Mr. COMER. Oh, no; he is no gambler; and no doubt Mr. Thompson is a nice man.

Mr. RANSDELL. He certainly is.

Mr. COMER. But when Mr. Thompson says that the present law is good, I have just shown you where it is not good.

Mr. RANSDELL. That is a difference of opinion.

Mr. COMER. There is no difference of opinion about it. I have shown you the statistics about it; I have shown you quotations themselves, and any business which makes that record, I do not care where it is, is wrong. You can not make that kind of a record and do a straight business. I read it to you a while ago. Mark you, Senator Percy was held up to the Senate as being a very smart man, and he is; but Senator Percy himself says that if this amendment goes into effect it will not have that deleterious and far-reaching effect in the exchanges that you say it will, and he is telling the truth.

Mr. RANSDELL. I believe the Senator admits that practically one-half of all the cotton is low grade, does he not?

Mr. COMER. The New York Wall Street Journal said 47 per cent was low grade last year. I say that the usual year more than two-thirds of the cotton is middling and above. Last year the New York Journal said 47 per cent was low grade.

Mr. RANSELL. I have always understood middling was, as its name indicates, the basis of the grades; that is, one-half in round numbers were above and one-half in round numbers below. However that may be, 47 per cent of the present crop, according to those figures of the New York Journal of Commerce, is low grade. The Senator will admit that is a very large percentage of the crop, and under his amendment, as I take it, all of that is abandoned—that is, left out and is not considered at all. There can be no insurance for all of that low grade, for that 47 per cent of a crop which is worth \$2,000,000,000. What has the Senator to say to that?

Mr. COMER. There is not any insured price for anything; there is nothing insured. The supply and demand market controls everything—low grade and all—and when you say the exchange insures anything, it is not an accurate statement.

Mr. RANSELL. Then, may I ask the Senator what is the function of the exchange if it be not to hedge cotton or to insure the cotton?

Mr. COMER. The function of the exchange is to make a true index of the value of cotton; that is what it is for. It is not to make the price; it is not to increase the price; it is to be the true index of cotton; that is what it is for.

Mr. RANSELL. Then, the Senator differs from Mr. Herbert Knox Smith. That gentleman, in a wonderfully interesting, elucidative, and exhaustive report made in 1908 as commissioner of corporations, recommended most emphatically that the exchanges were necessary because of their insurance guaranty, and the congressional committee which studied the question fundamentally and scientifically concurred in this recommendation. These capable and disinterested authorities assert they are essential to the trade.

The Senator seems to disagree with them. I showed here several days ago that the House Committee on Agriculture, in an able report, No. 765, of the Sixty-third Congress, spoke very highly of the cotton contract. It is not necessary to read it again, I imagine, and I merely quote from the report:

It is the opinion of the committee that the abolition of the cotton exchanges would result inevitably in the monopolizing of the entire cotton crop into the hands of a very few powerful interests, with the force and means to fix the price at which the farmer would be compelled to sell his cotton. Fully 75 per cent of American-produced cotton leaves the hands of the producer during the four months of September, October, November, and December. It takes no stretch of the imagination to foresee how utterly helpless the farmer, as a class, would be in his present disorganized condition as a factor in fixing the price of his own products as against the organized genius and money of the spinners and powerful spot-cotton dealers.

As against the men who, according to the Baltimore Manufacturers' Record, made in the State of South Carolina last year over 300 per cent; as against the men who, in the opinion of the great cotton convention of the American Cotton Association, held in the city of Montgomery, the capital city of the Senator's own State, three weeks ago, said that cotton could well bring 60 cents a pound at the present time, in view of the profits which the spinners were making on it.

This is not what I say; this is not what an exchange in New York or an exchange in New Orleans says; it is what the Agricultural Committee of the House of Representatives said when they had the Smith-Lever bill before them. They show, in substance, that if it were not for the exchanges, if it were not for the insuring feature, if it were not for the hedging which comes about on the exchanges in the great markets, if it were not, if you please, for the speculation indulged in by the great number of men in this country who like to speculate, the producers would be at the mercy of the spinners and the large spot-cotton dealers.

There is a big difference of opinion, I say to the Senator from Alabama and to other Senators, on this great question, and I should like to have the Senator from Alabama explain, when he says that these things are all wrong, how he knows that the members of the great Agricultural Committee of the House were mistaken, how he knows that Mr. Herbert Knox Smith was wrong—and Mr. Smith is not a cotton man; he has no interest in cotton—and how the Senator knows that men like Mr. Percy and Mr. Thompson and all the others are wrong. Mr. President, I desire to quote just an excerpt from Mr. Smith's report—Chapter I, page 58—to wit:

It should be emphasized that one of the great functions of a cotton exchange is the bringing together of buyers and sellers or their representatives. An exchange is a great market place. Transactions are, of course, greatly facilitated by the mere congregation of buyers and sellers and their representatives on the floor of an exchange. In the case of those exchanges on which a future business is conducted it should be noted that there are really two markets, one for future contracts and the other for spot cotton. The future market is not used to bring the producer and the spinner directly together but is rather a meeting place for cotton merchants (or their representatives) and brokers, who stand between the producer and the spinner. Spinners, for reasons explained in detail in a later part, do not ordinarily

receive their supplies of cotton directly on exchange contracts but enter into private arrangements with merchants or brokers for the particular kinds of cotton which they require. These merchants, moreover, ordinarily do not obtain the cotton which they need by receiving it on exchange contracts. Such merchants, as already emphasized, use the future market mainly for hedging purposes, and the future ring to this extent becomes, as already pointed out, a great clearing house for hedging transactions. * * * The enormous advantage of such hedging transactions to the spot merchant, however, has been fully illustrated, so that it should be apparent that the future market, while not designed to bring the final consumer into direct touch with the producer of cotton, may perform quite as legitimate a function as if it accomplished this result directly.

Of course, in addition to hedging transactions, a vast volume of speculative business is conducted in contracts. These, however, as just pointed out, are closely intertwined with hedging operations and may greatly facilitate the latter, although at times they undoubtedly are a source of disturbance.

Senators, a dogmatic assertion is one thing but proof is another.

Mr. COMER. I thoroughly indorse what Mr. Herbert Knox Smith has said; I quoted page after page from him, and would have quoted indefinitely had it not been for the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who was anxious to proceed with some bill which he had in charge. I turned the book containing the statement of Mr. Smith over to the Senator from Texas to read. It is one of the most interesting and one of the straightest stories I have ever seen; and if the Senator from Louisiana will read it, he will see that what I have been contending for is based in large degree upon the result of Mr. Smith's investigation. It is not the cotton exchanges we are fighting; we want the cotton exchanges; but we want them to function properly. When the exchanges function properly, then they are just as necessary as is any other part of the business. Their proper functioning, as Mr. Welch says, is this: If a man can go on the market and buy a thousand bales of cotton which he has not sold, and then can go and sell a thousand bales on contracts and have them carried through on the basis of the market, and not on the basis of the contracts, then they accomplish their purpose and function. We are not fighting against the exchanges; we are fighting against the improper practices of the exchanges. When they practice what is right, when they function properly, then they are of great use to the country.

In reference to profits, those of you who listened to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] in his discussion of the dye-products bill, and those of you who go abroad in the land, anywhere and everywhere, will realize that America is not idle. I dare say that nine-tenths of the business of the country is doing well. How do you think the people could pay the taxes if they were not? It is a good thing the country is doing well along that line; but do not any of you ever get the idea that I am decrying the exchanges, for I am not; it is the evil practices of the exchanges that I am trying to correct. The amendment I have proposed, if carried through, will correct those evils. It will very nearly produce a condition, in my opinion—and that is what they fear—where the exchange price will coordinate with the spot price; and, if it does, then the exchange will gain and not lose business, and it will give every business man the opportunity to take care of his business as everyone wants it taken care of.

When farmers talk about the cotton exchanges now they say that the prices fixed are paper prices. In Alabama we have a ticker law which prohibits bucket shops because of the great losses of the people who went in and watched the ticker.

I will inquire of the Senator from Louisiana if he desires to ask me any other question?

Mr. RANSELL. No.

Mr. COMER. I wish to thank the Senate for their courtesy; and I will say to the Senator from Louisiana that I have tried to be just as courteous to him as I could.

Mr. RANSELL. The Senator certainly has been.

Mr. COMER. And I have tried to be as fair to him as he has been to me.

Mr. RANSELL. I have no complaint at all.

Mr. COMER. I yield the floor.

Mr. RANSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to put into the Record one or two telegrams. I read first a very brief telegram from the Hon. I. N. McCollister, president of the Louisiana Farmers' Union. I have had it for some time; it is dated the 28th of March last, and addressed to me at Lake Providence, when I was at my home there. He says:

MANY, LA., March 28, 1920.

J. E. RANSELL,
United States Senator, Lake Providence, La.:

Kill the Comer rider to the Agriculture appropriation bill as it outlaws the majority of the cotton raised by farmers and destroys price insurance by futures.

I. N. MCCOLLISTER,
President Louisiana Farmers' Union.

Mr. McCollister lives at Many, La.; he is a farmer and lives in the hill section of north Louisiana, where he raises cotton.

I now read a telegram from Mr. H. Arthur Morgan, secretary-treasurer of the Association of State Farmers' Union Presidents. He is a farmer, living at Gonzales, La., and raises cotton and some cattle. His telegram is dated March 30, and he says:

GONZALES, LA., March 30, 1920.

Senator JOSEPH E. RANSELL,
Washington, D. C.:

The rider to the Agriculture appropriation bill by COMER if permitted to become law would so restrict the contract as to be a vital blow to its usefulness to the producers, sellers, and buyers of American cotton. Briefly, the Comer rider is in the interest of the cotton spinner and opposed to the cotton producers, and if incorporated in the law would mean a deathblow to the cotton producers. I hope you will do all in your power to eliminate this Comer rider entirely. The passage of the Comer rider would place the American farmer at the mercy of the American spinners and foreign manufacturers, as they would control the price of American cotton.

H. ARTHUR MORGAN,
Secretary-Treasurer Association State Farmers' Union Presidents.

Mr. Morgan, as I have said, is a cotton grower and cattleman. He is a member of the Louisiana Legislature and lives not far from the city of Baton Rouge, the capital of the State.

I now wish to read a copy of a letter which has been furnished me from Mr. J. A. Whitehurst, president of the State board of agriculture, Oklahoma city, Okla. The letter is dated April 28, is addressed to Hon. C. S. Barrett, president of the National Farmers' Union, Atlanta, Ga., and reads as follows:

STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
Oklahoma city, April 27, 1920.

Hon. C. S. BARRETT,
President National Farmers' Union,
Atlanta, Ga.

MY DEAR SIR: I see that Mr. COMER refers to you in his rider to the Agricultural bill on cotton grades as being favorable to his proposition. I am certainly very much surprised to know that you take this position, in which the spinners are so earnestly interested. I am sure that not only the majority but all of the farmers in the entire Southwest, where they are not influenced more or less by the spinners and dependent upon export markets for their cotton, are opposed to the Comer rider.

I am surprised at this time, when we are all trying to get together through the American Cotton Association to protect the interest of the farmer, to find such a division of opinion existing in the Atlantic States and the Southwest. I have been more surprised at the stand that Mr. Wannamaker has taken, professing such deep interest in behalf of the cotton farmer, and I feel that this move will have much to do with destroying any concrete movement on the part of the Southern States getting together in the American Cotton Association.

We are to have a State-wide meeting at the Capitol in Oklahoma city May 10 and 11, at which time we will make up our minds whether we will go ahead in the cotton business separate and independent from the Southeast States or not.

Assuring you again of the resentment felt by the cotton farmers of Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Arkansas, I am,
Very truly, yours,

J. A. WHITEHURST, President.

Just one word more, Mr. President. I wish to reiterate what I said several days ago, that the amendment of the Senator from Alabama, if written into law, will change a statute which was enacted by Congress in 1914 after the most earnest and sincere consideration, not for days, but for months and for years, for that measure was before Congress for several years. It is known as the Smith-Lever Cotton Futures Act. Under that act, passed in 1914, the exchanges of this country have been carrying on business since its adoption. It was amended slightly last year and restricted somewhat; the grades of "good ordinary" and "strict good ordinary" were taken out of the contract and the lowest limit was placed at "low middling."

Mr. COMER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. RANSELL. Just a moment; let me make this statement. I think the fair and the just thing to do is to bring this matter up before the committees of Congress, and give the cotton producers and the cotton spinners and the cotton exchanges, the three great interests involved, a chance to be heard. Practically only one side was heard when this measure came up—the spinners, most ably represented by the Senator from Alabama, who has told us here to-day that he and his companies have 200,000 spindles, eight big mills, in the State of Alabama. One side was represented here, Senators. Let us have this measure presented to a special committee, if you will, or to the Agricultural Committee, to Congress in a fair, open manner; not moved for the first time on the floor of the Senate, when we are not expecting it, and changing the entire law on such a valuable product as cotton.

Of the present supply, an unduly large portion is of low-grade cotton, because of the delay in gathering last fall on account of the shortage of labor and the consequent weather injury. Obviously the immediate effect of the Comer amend-

ment will be to upset dealings in cotton which require hedging, because a man will hesitate to sell a hedge under which he may be required to deliver more cotton above the grade of middling than he may possibly be able to command. At the same time the buyers of the large ratio of low-grade cottons still to be sold will be enabled to hammer the price upon the contention that such cottons will not be tenderable on contract. In the present situation, under the Comer amendment, it is a very reckless man who would agree to deliver, say, in September, any large volume of white middling cotton except at a price far beyond the present quotations. At the same time, a man would be equally as reckless who would agree, under that amendment, to purchase for September delivery cotton below middling at present quotations, if such cotton should be denied the privilege of tender on contract. The result to be reasonably expected from the Comer amendment is an artificial enhancement of the price of cotton above middling, and a corresponding depreciation of the price of cotton below middling.

All I ask, Mr. President, as a representative of the producers and also of the cotton exchange of my State—for I speak for it as well—is that the matter be delayed until we can study it, just as we studied the original Smith-Lever bill, and as we studied the amendment which was adopted last year. The proposed amendment goes much further and narrows and restricts the future contract far greater than the change made in 1919.

I now yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. COMER. In explanation of this amendment, I will say that two years ago a very extensive hearing was held on the conduct of the exchanges. Resulting from that, a very long discussion and investigation was held, and as a result of that the first Smith-Lever bill was passed, carrying 21 grades. The usufruct of that law did not bring the results that the makers of the bill and the people of the cotton States thought it would, and this amendment was passed; and while I am on that subject I want to tell you exactly how the amendment was passed.

It was proposed by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Smith] as a rider on the wheat-guaranty bill, just exactly like this was, and carried 7 grades. In the conference committee the number was changed from 7 to 10, and accepted by both sides, and it was passed. There was no examination nor anything else had at all and but very brief debate. It was passed before anybody knew it, and passed on the knowledge they had gotten from the examination of three years before.

This amendment was offered exactly like that was, with the same intent, and that was to get a reliable, safe, commercial, stabilized delivery. That was the whole intent of it, and it was the intent of the first one. The intent of this is simply to make the amendment of last year function, that is all.

You say that the subject should be gone into on a lengthy examination. Senator, I have said from the beginning that this amendment did not go as far as it ought to go. In talking with one of the Members of the House of Representatives who is on the committee, he suggested that there should be only three grades—middling, strict middling, and good middling. If this amendment falls I am going to try to have introduced somewhere, either here or in the House, a bill to make it but four grades—strict low middling, middling, strict middling, and good middling—and that will not hurt low-grade cotton. It does not "inlaw" or "outlaw" anything. It simply places the exchange on a basis where it will be an insurance on spot values, that is all.

I trust that this amendment will pass as it is. If it does not pass, and an investigation is held, I am going to go before it myself and fight for what? A more restrictive bill, because you want an exchange that will function. You can not drag all grades of cotton through an exchange or anywhere else, and you can not make the value there or anywhere else. You have got to make it on the markets of the world. The fact that we put one on here does not affect the price of cotton—I mean, it does not affect the price of that cotton. They can teeter the exchange price but they can not teeter the spot price. I am obliged to you.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After three minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, May 7, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 6, 1920.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

Mark W. Potter, of New York, to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the term expiring December 31, 1923. (New office created by the act approved February 28, 1920.)

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION.

Samuel W. McCall, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring September 7, 1928, vice Frank W. Taussig, resigned.

DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF MINES.

Frederick G. Cottrell, of California, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, vice Van H. Manning, resigned June 1.

RENT COMMISSION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mrs. Clara Sears Taylor, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Rent Commission of the District of Columbia, vice Guy Mason, resigned.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander Guy Whitlock to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1919.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1919:

William H. Lee,
Harold H. Ritter,
Harvey W. McCormack, and
Louis J. Gulliver.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) August Schulze to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 30th day of July, 1919.

Ensign Bernard F. Jenkins to be an assistant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1919.

Passed Asst. Surg. Joseph L. Schwartz, Medical Corps, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 10th day of December, 1918, to correct error in date as previously nominated and confirmed.

Asst. Surg. Russell J. Trout to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 30th day of January, 1919, to correct error in date as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named passed assistant paymasters to be paymasters in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant commander from the 7th day of December, 1919:

Irwin D. Coyle and
Paul A. Clarke.

Chaplain Thomas B. Thompson to be a chaplain in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 28th day of February, 1920.

Naval Constructor Daniel C. Nutting to be a naval constructor in the Navy with the rank of captain from the 21st day of January, 1920.

Assistant civil engineer for temporary service Carl H. Cotter to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 1st day of July, 1918, to correct error in name as previously nominated and confirmed.

Pay Clerk Peter J. Penner to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 6th day of January, 1920.

Paymaster Edward T. Hoopes to be a pay inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 4th day of April, 1920.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 5th day of June, 1920:

Laurence A. Abercrombie,
William V. Alexander, jr.,
William C. Allison,
Bern Anderson,
Albert S. Arkush,
Arthur De L. Ayrault, jr.,
George H. Bahm,
Harry W. Baltazzi,
Hampden O. Banks,
Morgan C. Barrett,
Virgil K. Bayless,
Edward P. Beach,
Charles H. Belcher,
Louis A. Benoist,
Wilson A. Benoist,
Burton B. Biggs,
Wesley C. Bobbitt,
Max I. Black,
Walter F. Boone,
Joseph F. Bolger,

Roscoe L. Bowman,
Charles E. Booth, jr.,
Wilbur F. Broun,
Harry A. Brandenburger,
William G. Buch,
Heber B. Brumbaugh,
Sydney S. Bunting,
Harry S. Bueche,
Carl H. Bushnell,
John G. Burrow,
Kenneth C. Caldwell,
Ralph E. Butterfield,
Guy Chadwick,
Jesse H. Carter,
Frederick G. Clay,
Nealy A. Chapin,
Oswald S. Colclough,
Howard Clark,
Oliver D. Colvin, jr.,
Sterling T. Cloughley,
William W. Cone,
Paul R. Coloney,
Allen B. Cook,
Arthur D. Condon,
John D. Corrigan,
Clarence V. Conlan,
Thomas O. Cullins, jr.,
Albert G. Cook, jr.,
Richard F. Cross, jr.,
Morton C. Hutchinson, jr.,
John J. Curley, jr.,
Arnold J. Isbell,
Duncan Curry, jr.,
Alan C. Curtiss,
Sampson G. Dalkowitz,
Thomas F. Darden, jr.,
Walter D. David,
Alan P. Davis,
Ransom K. Davis,
William S. G. Davis,
George H. De Baun,
Willard E. Dillon,
Sydney B. Dodds,
Samuel W. DuBois,
James R. Dudley,
Percy Earle,
Harold W. Eaton,
William G. Eaton,
Dew W. Eberle,
Alexander S. Edward,
Frank J. R. Eggers,
John M. Eggleston,
Edward H. Enright,
Charles F. Erck,
Thomas A. Estling, jr.,
William G. Fewel,
William F. Fitzgerald, jr.,
William B. Fletcher, jr.,
James L. Fly, jr.,
Edwin G. Fullinwider,
Daniel V. Gallery, jr.,
Gerard F. Galpin,
Kinloch N. Gardner,
Olin E. Gates,
William A. Gorry,
Alfred M. Granum,
Edwin D. Graves, jr.,
Alexander J. Gray, jr.,
Clark L. Green,
Nathan Green, jr.,
John F. Grube,
Elmon B. Guernsey,
Harry A. Guthrie,
Edward E. Haase,
Benjamin L. Halley,
William M. Hainer,
Grover B. H. Hall,
James E. Hamilton,
Edgar W. Hampson,
Byron H. Hanlon,
Harlo H. Hardy,
Bryan C. Harper,
James C. Harris, jr.,
John W. Harris,
Walter J. Harrison,

Leonidas E. Hill, jr.,
 Thaddeus B. Hopper,
 Paul E. Howard,
 Joseph C. Hubbard,
 Howard H. Hubbell,
 Roy C. Hudson,
 John H. P. Hughart, jr.,
 Linfield L. Hunt,
 Ralph B. Hunt,
 Stuart H. Ingersoll,
 Virgil V. Jacomini,
 William B. Jackson, jr.,
 Llewellyn J. Johns,
 Leon J. Jacobi,
 Delamer L. Jones,
 John W. Jamison,
 Allan E. Julin,
 Bascom S. Jones,
 Frederick G. Kahn,
 John G. Jones,
 Marion R. Kelley,
 William W. Juvenal,
 Richmond K. Kelly,
 Brian B. Kane,
 Roland R. Killian,
 William P. Kellogg, 2d,
 Frederick D. Kime,
 Thomas J. Kelly,
 Edward T. Kline,
 William M. Killingsworth,
 Andrew W. Knisley,
 James Kirkpatrick, jr.,
 Lloyd Lafot,
 Charles R. Kloman,
 William G. Lalor,
 Franklin B. Kohrs,
 John E. Lawson, jr.,
 Burton G. Lake,
 Wilson D. Leggett, jr.,
 Philip D. Lampert,
 Maris V. Lewis,
 Andrew P. Lawton,
 Lawrence Litchfield, jr.,
 George A. Leighton,
 Harold E. McCarthy,
 Gerald D. Linke,
 Wayne A. McDowell,
 Leonard Le B. Lyons, jr.,
 William B. McHugh,
 Frank C. McClure,
 Renwick S. McIver,
 Joseph A. McGinley,
 Cecil G. McKinney,
 Francis X. McInerney,
 Heber H. McLean,
 Francis J. McKenna,
 Burns Macdonald, jr.,
 Frank M. McLaury,
 Atherton Macondray, jr.,
 Ralph E. McShane,
 Charles J. Maguire,
 James S. MacKinnon,
 William E. Makosky,
 Charles G. Magruder, jr.,
 William L. Maxson,
 Artyn L. Main,
 De Long Mills,
 Harold L. Meadow,
 Campbell H. Minckler,
 William R. Millis,
 Theodore O. Molloy,
 Edward J. Milner,
 Walter E. Moore,
 Lucian A. Moebus,
 Leland W. Morrow,
 Gilbert B. Myers,
 Thomas G. Murrell,
 Christopher Noble,
 Ralph O. Myers,
 Timothy J. O'Brien,
 Kenneth H. Noble,
 John L. B. Olson,
 Clarence E. Olsen,
 Archie Paley,
 Leo L. Pace,

George H. L. Peet,
 Gordon B. Parks,
 Paul E. Pihl,
 Raymond C. Percival,
 James C. Pollock,
 John E. Pixton,
 Charles R. Pratt,
 William C. Powell,
 William F. Ramsey,
 Joe L. Raichle,
 Paul J. Register,
 William L. Rees,
 Carl H. Reynolds, jr.,
 James C. Reisinger,
 Harry E. Rice, jr.,
 Charles W. Rhodes,
 Francis J. Riley,
 George L. Richmire,
 Kilburn H. Roby,
 James L. Robertson,
 Willis N. Rogers,
 Joseph W. Rodes,
 Paul E. Roswall,
 David B. Rossheim,
 Joe E. Rucker,
 Edward E. Roth,
 Thomas J. Ryan, jr.,
 John C. Rule,
 Joseph O. Saurette,
 Ralph C. Sanson,
 Norman O. Schwien,
 Edwin W. Schell,
 Joseph Seletski,
 Malcolm E. Selby,
 Burce Settle,
 Mortimer E. Serat, jr.,
 Eugene P. Sherman,
 Glenn H. Sheldon,
 Roy M. Signer,
 Carleton Shugg,
 Rodger W. Simpson,
 Roland E. Simpson,
 Edwin F. Smellie,
 Barnett Sisson,
 Sherwood B. Smith,
 Talbot Smith,
 John A. Snackenber,
 Elmer D. Snare,
 Robert C. Sprague,
 Ralph R. Stogsdall, jr.,
 Robert Strite,
 William E. Sullivan,
 Fred Morris, jr.,
 Ralph D. F. Sweeney,
 Donald R. Tallman,
 Wendell G. Switzer,
 Warren F. Taylor,
 Raymond D. Tarbuck,
 Rufus G. Thayer,
 Lyman A. Thackrey,
 Edward M. Thompson,
 Colin J. Thomas,
 Rutledge B. Tompkins,
 Carlton R. Todd,
 Walter S. K. Trapnell,
 Lloyd L. Tower,
 Joseph C. Van Cleve,
 Arnold E. True,
 Claiborne J. Walker,
 George van Deurs,
 Richard M. Watt, jr.,
 John A. Waters, jr.,
 William Webster, jr.,
 Thomas L. Wattles,
 Charles Wellborn, jr.,
 Max Welborn,
 Forrest H. Wells,
 Timothy F. Wellings,
 Charles D. Wheelock,
 Robert K. Wells,
 Wilbur A. Wiedman,
 Charles A. Whiteford,
 John H. Willis,
 Henry G. Williams,
 Paul B. Wishart,

Dwight H. Wilson,
Charles P. Woodson,
John P. Womble, jr.,
George S. Young,
Ray F. Yager,
Thomas E. Zellars,
Parke G. Young,
Carl A. L. Sundberg, and
Rupert M. Zimmerli.

The following-named midshipmen to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 5th day of June, 1920:

Henry T. Birmingham,
Hjalmar A. Christensen,
Louis E. Marie, jr.,
Ivan W. Miller,
Joe N. Smith, and
James H. Strother.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 6, 1920.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

Charles E. Herring to be Second Assistant Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICE.

Victor G. Cozad, Burns, Oreg.
William H. Canon, Roseburg, Oreg.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Andrew J. Foster, Lakeview, Oreg.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

To be lieutenant commanders.

Lieut. Joseph R. Redman.
Lieut. Franklin G. Percival.
Lieut. Theo D. Westfall.
Lieut. Theodore D. Ruddock, jr.
Lieut. Zeno W. Wicks.
Lieut. Andrew H. Addoms.
Lieut. William H. Porter, jr.
Lieut. Sherrod H. Quarles.
Lieut. Alfred H. Balsley.
Lieut. William E. Malloy.
Lieut. Greene W. Dugger, jr.
Lieut. John M. Creighton.
Lieut. Charles D. Swain.
Lieut. Edmund W. Burrough.
Lieut. Albert H. Rooks.
Lieut. George F. Neiley.
Lieut. Russell E. Perry.
Lieut. Byron B. Ralston.
Lieut. Stanley L. Wilson.
Lieut. Herbert J. Ray.
Lieut. Charles E. Rosendahl.
Lieut. John G. Moyer.
Lieut. Richard B. Coffman.
Lieut. Emory F. Clement.
Lieut. Louis C. Scheibla.
Lieut. Patrick N. L. Bellinger.
Lieut. William T. Mallison.
Lieut. Newton H. White, jr.

To be a lieutenant.

Chief Boatswain William L. Hill.

MARINE CORPS.

To be a lieutenant colonel.

Maj. William L. Redles.

To be majors.

Capt. Ralph E. Davis.
Capt. Harry W. Weitzel.
Capt. Sidney N. Raynor.

POSTMASTERS.

GEORGIA.

Rufus G. Strickland, Reidsville.

INDIANA.

Harry R. Burns, Flora.
Theodore Hoss, Fowler.
Ernest L. Lambert, Hope.
Walter C. Farrell, Middletown.
Orville E. Steward, Rossville.
John N. Hunter, South Bend.

KANSAS.

William M. Burkholder, Anthony.
Stella B. Sizelove, Coats.

William J. Taylor, Colby.
Charles E. Schul, Grenola.
George W. Harley, McCune.
Elizabeth Newman, Towanda.

LOUISIANA.

Joseph E. Ryan, Berwick.
George D. Nash, Logansport.

MICHIGAN.

John B. Ahearn, Kinde.

MISSISSIPPI.

Ethan A. Wood, Woodville.

NEVADA.

John W. Christian, Pioche.

NEW MEXICO.

Frank Canavan, Gallup.
Arthur B. Wimberly, Hagerman.
Fred V. Conniff, Hillsboro.

NEW YORK.

E. De Lancy Walters, Bolivar.
John B. Duignan, Canastota.
George Diefendorf, Chaumont.
George H. Carley, Cooperstown.
Maurice F. Axtell, Deposit.
Addison L. Slate, Marathon.
John C. F. Walker, Newport.
Herbert G. Corey, Northville.
Mary Van de Bogart, Red Hook.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Archibald A. McKeithen, Aberdeen.
Edward P. McCoy, Pisgah Forest.

OREGON.

Leonard J. Locher, Burns.
Charles H. Skinner, Hermiston.
William C. Foster, Tillamook.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Robert L. McNeely, Westminster.

TEXAS.

Henry J. Caldwell, Alba.
Seth W. Lawrence, Anson.
Manton W. Williams, Sinton.
Hal M. Knight, Sterling City.
John L. Brunner, Taylor.
John P. Olive, Windom.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, May 6, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. G. Campbell Morgan, of London, England, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pause in Thy presence, remembering that Thou art all wise. We seek Thy wisdom. We thank Thee that the foundation of Thy throne is ever that of justice. Teach us to walk in the ways of justice. We bless Thee that we remember that Thy heart is the heart of infinite and unfathomable compassion. Grant unto us that all our doings may be inspired with love in response to Thy love. This day guide in the deliberation of those upon whom Thou hast set the high responsibility of leading a great people in the way of truth, honor, justice, and mercy. Hear us as we thus present our petition to Thee and grant us the answers of Thy wisdom and Thy love. We ask it in the name of our Lord and King. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13870, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. ANDERSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON] pending when the committee rose.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 3, amend by striking out the figures \$2,357,000 and inserting in lieu thereof \$2,569,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I find that in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing there are about 2,100 employees classed as operatives. The number varies slightly from time to time. These employees do all the work toward the preparing, examining, trimming, inspecting, counting, perforating, and assorting of all the money, bonds, and postage stamps used in this country. They take the material from the time it comes from the printer and do all this until it is a finished product. These people do a class of work that requires skill and the greatest kind of concentration and attention. I do not believe there is a class of employees in the Government service whose work is as concentrated as the work of these employees. They are placed on tasks that require them to work every minute of time from 8 in the morning until 4 in the afternoon. They are not allowed to leave the building during that time. I am told that at least 50 per cent of them have dependents, and yet these people are paid, on the average, \$720 to \$800 a year, or \$2.50 a day. I do not see how they can live on it. They do a class of work that requires skill and attention; and not only that, they are doing a class of work that requires responsibility. These people handle all the currency, bonds, and stamps of this Government; they are held responsible for every piece of paper that comes into their possession.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I will.

Mr. LAYTON. Is it not a fact that they handle such paper that a slight mistake will cause great loss to the Government?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. That is true. I have watched these people work. I have seen women handling six to eight thousand sheets of paper a day, putting them through the trimming and perforating machines, and they have to bring each sheet on the side and the end to a needle point. They wear shades over their eyes, and they tell me that their eyes frequently give out. When you pass by their desks they do not look up.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman realize that the distinguished chairman of this committee handles \$500,000,000 here—

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. And he gets reasonable pay.

Mr. BLANTON. If you compare the pay of these employees and the amount of money that is handled, the gentleman will see that they are not so very far apart.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Oh, the argument of the gentleman is utterly ridiculous. The only thing that this amendment does is to bring the standard of pay of these employees in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing up to the same standard that we are paying in the Printing Office. The employees there get \$2.80 per day, and I do not see how they live on that. Certainly these employees ought to get equal pay with the other bureau, because they have more difficult work, they have to handle more valuable property, and they are responsible for every piece of paper. These employees, 50 per cent of them, have dependents. They get from \$720 to \$800 a year, or \$2.50 a day.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will show me 100 clerks down there—yes, if he will show me 15 clerks down there who get less than \$3.13 a day, I will agree to his amendment. There is not a person down there but what gets \$3.13, according to the statement of the director of the bureau.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. That is unfortunate, because either the gentleman from Iowa is in error or the director of the bureau this morning stated a falsehood to me. I went over these figures with the director, and he tells me that the calculation I have made will bring the pay of these employees up to what is paid to the employees of the Printing Office.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman ought to have read the hearings. If he does he will find that the most of these employees are getting over \$3.45. With the bonus they all get at least \$3.13.

Mr. ROMJUE. They are receiving only \$2.37 a day, and the bonus brings them to \$3.13.

Mr. GOOD. And the bonus is prescribed by law as an additional compensation.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I am talking about the basic pay.

Mr. GOOD. I am talking about the pay; I do not care whether it is received in one envelope or two envelopes. When the gentleman says they are not receiving \$3.13 he is mistaken. The fact is that they receive \$3.13 as the lowest pay. When the director made his estimate he frankly said that he made it in that way, because he did not know whether Congress would give the bonus or not. We have already carried the

bonus for the next year. So we are giving them with this provision a minimum of \$3.13 a day, and most of them get over \$3.50 a day.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. With the bonus you are paying them between \$900 and \$1,000 a year, are you not?

Mr. GOOD. There are different rates of pay. One hundred and forty-six get \$3.13 a day, 15 get \$3.18 a day, 122 get \$3.26, 48 get \$3.32, 468 get \$3.38 a day, 227 get \$3.45 a day, and they range from that up to \$3.76 and \$3.80 a day.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Is there any reason why these employees in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing should not be paid equal compensation with the employees in the Public Printing Office?

Mr. GOOD. Is there any reason why we should take out of the pockets of the taxpayers money to pay these girls that are doing this work twice as much as the gentleman would pay a girl to work about 12 hours a day in his kitchen?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Does the gentleman deny that the employees in every hotel and restaurant in this town are not getting as much as these girls are?

Mr. GOOD. I will give the gentleman the minimum wage.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. It is \$16 a week.

Mr. GOOD. And there is not one here who is not getting more than \$18 a week.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I beg to differ with the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, is this a privileged matter, or how does it come up?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has offered an amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask recognition against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] rose, and the Chair will recognize him first.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, may the amendment be again reported?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield first to me, so that I may see whether or not we can have an agreement on time for debate on amendments to this paragraph?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa that the point of order has been reserved.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, on the point of order—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order. Let us first dispose of the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to get a little information in regard to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois demands the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois permit me to ask the chairman a question or two about the point of order?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to find out from the chairman whether or not these salaries are fixed by law.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It would not make any difference if they were.

Mr. GOOD. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to fix them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, Mr. Chairman, it is not subject to the point of order, and I withdraw it.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 20 minutes, 5 minutes of that time to go to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN], 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], and 5 minutes to myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, to be divided in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. KELLER. I object.

Mr. GOOD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate be limited to 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa that all debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be adopted. In addition to what the distinguished chairman of the committee has said, you will find, on page 216 of the hearings, that of those who are receiving a base pay with a bonus there are only eight who receive \$3.80 per day and only two

who receive \$3.50 a day, so that it will be seen that only a very small number receive that base pay with the bonus which would correspond at all with the pay of those who are working in the Printing Office. On page 217 the director says that, considering the rigid responsibility in which these employees are held, due to the very character and nature of their work, he thinks they are underpaid in comparison with other branches of the public service here in Washington. That is the statement of the director in charge of these employees. The record shows, on the pages referred to, that the employees in the Printing Office, who do work of no higher character, work that does not require such a high technical knowledge, of no more experience, receive the same amount that the employees of this bureau would receive if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri should be agreed to. Why should we provide for four or five thousand employees in the Printing Office at a certain pay, which is fairly commensurate to the employment in which they are engaged, and just across the Mall, where we have 4,000 high-class, competent women doing work that requires a higher degree of technical experience, people who are held responsible for all the material placed in their hands, we should compel them to work at a lower price than is paid for similar work in the Printing Office?

Mr. LAYTON. Do I understand that the employees in the Government Printing Office receive a bonus?

Mr. RAKER. They receive a bonus, and their pay is what the pay of these people would be if this amendment were agreed to. There can not be any distinction drawn, there should not be any distinction drawn, and to say that we are extravagant is unfounded. This is the highest technical work in the Government of that class. It is work that the Government needs, it is work that requires careful attention, and it is not work that you can do away with.

The women employees of the bureau work altogether on securities of the United States Government, and each one is personally responsible for every bond, stamp, note, coupon, and so forth, that passes through her hands. From the time the blank paper is first drawn from stock until it becomes a finished security, each person handling it must pay face value for any sheet or part of sheet that is missing at the end of the day. The women examiners who make the final count of Federal currency must make good any shortages reported by the banks. On the other hand, the women employees of the Government Printing Office engaged in the printing of books, pamphlets, and so forth, and who do not have the responsibility that these girls do, receive an entrance wage of \$2.80 a day compared with the employees in the Bureau of Printing and Engraving rate of \$2.37. These rates are exclusive of the temporary bonus.

You may say we have too many employees. We are paying a large sum of money for this work, but the work is necessary for the functioning of the Government. We must have this work that is turned out by these people in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and it is an injustice to them, it is unfair to them, that they should not be given the same pay as others in the service here in Washington are receiving, and we are not criticizing anyone. Far be it from me to criticize the members of the Committee on Appropriations or any of them, but here is a matter that is in the hands of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and the House, where the matter has been fully presented to them, where a question of injustice is being done. Private employers pay the persons whom they employ higher wages than this. The work must be done; you can not curtail it. I feel sure the House will agree that the wages of these 4,000 low-paid women employees in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing ought not be less than the wages paid the women employees of the Government Printing Office, when we find that such pay is not too large. I am for this amendment and trust the committee will agree to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON] is a little inaccurate in having us believe that there are any employees in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing receiving as low as \$2.37 a day. He should not merely take what is known as the base pay and cling to that only. As a matter of fact, they are getting not only that basic pay but an additional \$240 bonus also, which every employee receiving less than \$2,500 a year receives, paid proportionately every two weeks in his envelope. Now, this same table, found on page 216 of the hearings, shows the following: There are 468 employees receiving \$3.38 a day; there are 227 employees re-

ceiving \$3.45 a day; there are 27 employees receiving \$3.51 a day; there are 136 employees receiving \$3.64 a day; there are 20 employees receiving \$3.60 a day; there are 6 employees receiving \$3.80 a day; there are 38 employees receiving \$3.32 a day; there are 181 employees receiving \$3.51 a day; there are 84 employees receiving \$3.64 a day; there are 59 employees receiving \$3.76 a day; and there are 8 employees receiving \$3.80 a day. All of these are unskilled employees.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Are these employees entitled to 30 days' leave of absence with full pay, and in addition entitled to 30 days' sick leave in addition to a half Saturday?

Mr. BLANTON. No one knows that better than the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, who has had these questions before him for the last 40 years. Not all of them, as the gentleman from Missouri would have us believe, are heads of families. Most of them are unskilled, young, inexperienced girls. If the gentleman will go down and watch the employees work, he will see that many of them are young, inexperienced girls who could not get that much salary in the gentleman's district in Missouri. As said by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, they get 30 days' leave each year, vacation on full pay, and in addition to that I feel sure they come within the class who get 30 days' sick leave additional on a doctor's certificate, and you will find some doctors in the District of Columbia who make a living in making certificates for this extra 30 days' sick leave as well as for intoxicating liquors. Not only that but they get a half holiday every Saturday in the three summer months; not only that but they get the 52 Sunday holidays; not only that but they get all the national holidays we get in various parts of the United States, and in addition to that they get a holiday on the numerous special occasions which happen so frequently in the District of Columbia.

Mr. CANNON. And will they go on the retired list at a certain age as soon as the bill which passed the House the other day becomes a law?

Mr. BLANTON. In the law passed, not by the vote of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois or myself, but passed by this House and the Senate, they will go on the retired list when they get to be 65 years of age.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAYTON. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended for one minute to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Delaware that the time has been limited by the committee.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, there is no occasion for any Member of Congress to throw a fit over the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON]. My friend from Texas gets unduly excited, and in getting thus excited he runs away from the facts. I am informed that these girls affected by this amendment do not receive the 30 days' leave of absence to which the gentleman referred. It is true that they get 30 days' sick leave, but so does everybody else on the Government pay roll.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee will substantiate the statement that I now make that I have tried to support my colleagues on the subcommittee which prepared this sundry civil bill on practically the entire bill. There are but two or three items on which I have reserved my right to disagree with the majority of that subcommittee. The chairman will recall that I was interested in this proposition suggested by the gentleman from Missouri when we were considering this bill in committee. Why waste the time of this Congress and get so unduly excited over what I might term a most Christian amendment? Let us pass it now.

The women and girls in this bureau who will be benefited by this amendment work altogether on securities of the United States Government, and each of these employees is personally responsible for every bond, stamp, note, coupon, and so forth, that passes through her hands. From the time the blank paper is first drawn from stock until it becomes a finished security, each person handling it must pay face value for any sheet or part of sheet that is missing at the end of the day. The women examiners who make the final count of Federal currency must make good any shortages reported by the banks.

On the other hand, the women employees of the Government Printing Office engaged in the printing of books and pamphlets and reports of committees, and who do not have the responsibility that the women and girls in whose behalf the present amendment is offered, receive an entrance wage of \$2.80 a day, compared with a rate received by the latter class of \$2.37 a day. Does not this House believe that a job carrying with it the responsibility that these women and girls have on their

shoulders ought to carry a higher rate of wages? The chairman of the Appropriations Committee laid certain information before the subcommittee considering this bill which I do not believe was well founded. Because of that information the committee agreed that perhaps just now it would not be well to raise these wages.

I am heart and soul in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri—

Mr. LAYTON. And there is no information before this House that there are a large number of physicians in the District of Columbia who make a living falsifying and forging sick certificates.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Of course there is not, and no one believes that any such practice exists among the physicians of Washington, D. C.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, my time has not yet expired. I have not finished. I know how hard this committee has had to work, and no man in the House ought to have the sympathy of his colleagues in any greater degree than the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], our chairman. He has worked from morning until midnight on this bill, and he has done a remarkable job. Yet, as I said in opening, I dislike to see a simple proposition such as is contained in this amendment excite any Member of this House—even the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who seems to get excited about everything nowadays. For the life of me I can not see how these women and girls exist on the niggardly allowance they receive, and I ask the House to accept the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON]. [Applause.]

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. For the purpose of discussing the amendment and supporting it.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has been limited, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this is only one of the many demands made upon the committee to increase the wages of Government employees. The committee felt that inasmuch as the reclassification committee had recently made its report, and that action would likely be taken by Congress along the line of fixing the pay of Government employees, it was not within the province of this committee to invade that field at all. Now, the gentleman said that these employees do not receive the 30 days' leave. All I know about it is the testimony and the statement of the director who has charge of this bureau. I asked him these questions, as shown on page 217 of the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. What leave do they have?

Mr. WILMOT. Thirty days in the year, but no sick leave.

The CHAIRMAN. They have holidays in addition to that?

Mr. WILMOT. Yes, sir. There are, counting the 14 half holidays, 13 or 14 holidays.

These girls, all of them, have about 43 or 44 days of leave with pay every year. Now, the gentleman says they are paid at a smaller rate than other employees in the District. Let us see whether they are paid a smaller rate. The minimum that the Secretary can allow them is \$3.13 a day. The wages as established in the District of Columbia by the minimum-wage board of the District are as follows: For printing trades—and that is comparable to the work that these girls are doing—\$15.50 minimum, or \$2.58 a day, as compared with the Government wage for the same class of work of \$3.13 as a minimum wage. In the mercantile trades the minimum-wage board has fixed the rate at \$16.50 a week or \$2.75 a day. For hotels and restaurants, the class of workmen the gentleman from Missouri classes these people with, they receive \$16.50 a week, or \$2.75 a day, as compared with a minimum wage here of \$3.13.

But that is not all. The committee has given enough money here, with an estimate of the reduction in work, of more than 10 per cent as compared with the present year, and the reduction will be more than 10 per cent. My own opinion is that there will be money enough appropriated by this act so that if the director and the Secretary of the Treasury desire they can raise the pay of this class of employees so that no person will receive less than \$3.50 a day or even more. This amendment would be making an appropriation in the dark and not in the face of all the facts. The gentleman who has made the motion and the gentlemen who have spoken in favor of it have shown by their statements that they do not know the conditions that surround these employees and did not know the wages received or the leave with pay or the other conditions of employment. They do not know what the minimum-wage board has fixed as a minimum wage for other employees. They do not know the splendid surroundings—

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. No; I can not yield.

They do not know the splendid surroundings in which these girls work. Why, there is not a finer factory building in all the world than the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. It is a modern plant, with modern rest room, and with modern facilities, and most moderate prices for the lunches for those who buy their lunches there. And those who desire to take their lunches there have every convenience not afforded by the ordinary printing office.

I think the committee has acted very liberally with these persons, and I deplore the fact that gentlemen get excited because somebody from home, representing some organization, sends a telegram to his Member of Congress to vote for this amendment. That is the poorest of excuses for any man to act upon. That is the poorest excuse for anybody to vote money out of the Public Treasury. It seems to me that the committee in reporting this estimate, if it has been in error at all, has been on the side of liberality in the appropriation. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 65, yeas 43.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For wages of plate printers, at piece rates to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, not to exceed the rates usually paid for such work, including the wages of printers' assistants, when employed, \$1,905,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That no portion of this sum shall be expended for printing United States notes or Treasury notes of larger denominations than those that may be canceled or retired, except in so far as such printing may be necessary in executing the requirements of the act to define and to fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes, approved March 14, 1900: *Provided further*, That no part of this sum shall be used to increase the wages of plate printers until all printers' assistants receive not less than \$2.37 per day.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri offers the following amendment: Amend by striking out the figures "\$1,905,000" after the word "employed" on line 17 of page 18, and by inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,023,125."

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the other amendment I offered was with respect to operatives in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. There are about 2,000 of those. There are also about 1,500 printers' assistants in the bureau. If you go over there, you will find these printing machines at work, and the power presses have one man who is in charge, a printer, and as he stands there he is responsible for the operation of the machine and lays his hands over the plate to see if it is in proper condition. The women are the assistants, and they see to it that each sheet is placed on the die in the proper manner and is taken off in the proper shape. They act as assistants to the printers. The truth of the matter is the printer is paid by the piece, and, naturally, he sets a rapid pace, and these women who act as assistants are compelled to keep the pace that he sets, and the result is that they have got to stay there with tremendous concentration from 8 o'clock in the morning until 4 o'clock in the afternoon, with the exception of the 30 minutes which they are allowed for lunch.

Now, these women, together with the women provided for in the other amendment, are the only people who touch our bonds or our currency or our stamps in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. The printers themselves do not handle the paper at all. The paper comes in and these two classes of people take hold of it—first, the printers' assistants, who print it—

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. BEE. Will the effect of this amendment be to bring them to the same pay that they get for similar work in the Government Printing Office?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. No. It brings them up to the minimum pay received in the Government Printing Office.

Mr. BEE. Up to the minimum pay received in the Government Printing Office?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes. These women are receiving \$2.37 per day as base pay, and then they get their bonus;

and this will bring them up to \$2.80 base pay, the amount that the women get for similar work in the Government Printing Office, and in addition to that amount they will get the bonus, I assume.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will these girls get the \$240 in addition to their regular pay?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I assume so.

Mr. KNUTSON. How much will that bring them up to?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. They are getting a little less than \$740. That will bring them up to \$860. They now get \$740 per year base pay. The director tells me that about 50 per cent of the women over there have dependents, and I will tell you I do not see how they live.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] talks about our getting telegrams, as if we were actuated by political influence. I have not received a single telegram, and I will tell you that I am moved solely by a sense of justice to these poor women and, knowing what I do about conditions over there, I would be ashamed of myself if I did not offer this amendment. I have seen the intense concentration with which these women work, and I know the pay that they are getting and the pay that is given elsewhere, and I know that the women in these two classes are the only ones that touch the paper from the time it goes into this plant until it comes out a finished product either as postage stamps, revenue stamps, bonds, or paper money ranging in bills from \$1 to \$10,000 each, and yet the employees who make these bonds and this money are paid only \$2.50 per day, base pay. If I did not stand up here and speak in their behalf when I know what the cost of living in Washington is, when I myself have a hard time of it to live here upon my own salary, in the face of these facts if I did not stand up for these women, who are getting less than \$1,000 a year for the hard work which they are doing and with which they must support themselves and their dependents, I would be ashamed of myself. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the temper of the House is to remain the same as it was shown by the vote just taken, I assume that this amendment will be agreed to. But it ought not to be agreed to, and in saying that I think I speak advisedly.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Newton] speaks in regard to the minimum wages, and on this matter we might as well understand what we are doing. Something over 75 per cent of these girls are white girls, and about 25 per cent or more are colored. The girls that are employed here in doing this work are not skilled workwomen. They are, as I am informed, the same class of girls that you and I employ as domestics in our kitchens, but of course have some training that they get at this bureau. I would hate myself the longest day of my life if I would come on the floor of this House and vote to pay a girl in one of the Government establishments—pay her out of the Federal Treasury—and vote to pay her almost twice what I would be willing to pay that same girl for work in my own kitchen. [Applause.] You gentlemen who are employing domestics are paying, as a general rule, from \$10 to \$12 per week. Here you propose to pay them around \$21 per week.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield for a question.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman tell us where we can get a domestic servant for \$11 a week these days? It costs \$65 a month in my town.

Mr. GOOD. Now, these girls are given some advantages that you and I do not give them in private employment.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes; in private employment—

Mr. GOOD. I am not yielding to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GOOD. These girls are working under very advantageous conditions. They are given, as I said before, 30 days' leave with pay and 13 or 14 holidays every year with pay. They are not employees, if you please, that have families to support. It is not that class of employees that you are dealing with here now. But that fact would have little weight.

When I spoke of the fact that we were receiving telegrams I spoke advisedly, because Members have come to me with their telegrams. Some of them I saw standing up voting for the

amendment. I do not know what actuated them. Perhaps it was sympathy with these girls. I assume that it was a high motive that actuated them to vote for these amendments. But I say to the House and to the committee that when I receive a telegram of that kind I look upon it with suspicion, because I know that the person in my district that sends me the telegram knows nothing about the employment, nothing with regard to the wage or the conditions, and is simply doing what somebody has asked him to do.

I hope the House will pay no attention to them. We will dignify ourselves by casting such telegrams and letters of that kind into the wastebasket, where they belong. They ought not to be dignified by receiving any attention in the committee or on the floor of the House.

I think it is a mistake to raise this appropriation. If we are to take appropriations of this kind and raise them without any more justification than you have for this, you should forget all about your protestations of economy, all about cutting appropriations, and then just take the bill and grant the maximum that is demanded by a department and let the taxpayers pay the bill. Gentlemen on the other side of the aisle may justify their votes, for they are not responsible for the appropriations; but we are on this side.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. What does economy amount to when you can bask in the smile and the approval of the Federal Employees' Union? [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Well, that is true.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. A moment ago the gentleman suggested that these employees were of the same class as employees engaged in domestic service. Is it not a fact that domestic servants get three meals a day at the expense of their employers, who pay them \$40 or \$50 a month besides, while these employees do not?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; that is true; and credit should be given to that extent.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Does the gentleman think anybody can live on \$60 a month in this country now?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; thousands do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

Mr. NOLAN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. GOOD. I shall have to insist on closing debate on these amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa objects. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Newton].

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Division, Mr. Chairman. Let us know who in the House are in favor of economy.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 47, noes 33.

Mr. GOOD. I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. Good and Mr. Newton of Missouri.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 61, noes 44.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

The announcement of the result was received with applause. The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE.

For expenses of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance under the act approved October 6, 1917, as amended:

Compensation: For the payment of military and naval compensation for death or disability, \$125,000,000; and the unexpended balances of the appropriations for military and naval compensation for the fiscal year 1920 are continued and made available during the fiscal year 1921 for the payment of compensation for death or disability.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word, and asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I heartily approve of this item of \$125,000,000 for compensation for death and disability under the war-risk insurance act, and also the following item of \$46,000,000 for hospital care, both items for the benefit of the veterans of the World War or the families of deceased soldiers. I believe there is also included in the lines at the top of page 20 something over \$20,000,000. A little further on there is, for vocational training for disabled soldiers, an item of \$90,000,000. The so-called Wason bill will within a

short time become a law, which I am informed carries something like \$7,000,000. We also have an item for additional hospital construction of about \$300,000 and about \$10,000,000 for administrative purposes, making in all at least \$300,000,000 for the next fiscal year for the benefit of the disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war, or their families. If the need existed I would very gladly vote double this sum, or any other sum to be expended for the benefit of the sick, the disabled, the needy, or the families of the disabled and the dead. We owe an obligation to those men to deal as liberally by them and by their dependents as their needs may require. I have proposed some of the legislation giving better care and assistance to this class of men, and I have favored all such legislation proposed by others when before the House. I will go just as far as any Member of Congress covering these needs, and I think the veterans in my district have realized my personal and official interest in their welfare. We can not overdo the opportunity to aid those who were disabled during the late war, and the taxpayers of the country will be back of us in every move of that kind. They will gladly pay that bill.

But I want very briefly to refer to the other class of assistance for which there is such a demand in this House at the present time. In the so-called bonus legislation this feature that I have just been referring to, of assistance to the disabled, does not appear in any shape or form. I think that if we went out and asked for the opinion of the public to-day as to what the so-called bonus legislation was expected to cover, we would find the opinion prevailing in the minds of the public that it was for the distressed and the disabled and the needy, not for the men who returned to their vocations in civil life in as good or perhaps in better physical condition than when they went into the service. When we speak of assistance to the veterans of the late war, it seems to me the sick and the disabled are the class of people whom the public expect should receive the benefit of our congressional action.

During my service in Congress no subject has been as difficult a problem to study and decide upon the proper course of action as this so-called bonus legislation. As you know, a resolution of this House referred the subject matter to the Committee on Ways and Means on February 26.

On March 2 that committee commenced hearings and held them continuously all during the month of March. During the month of April a sincere effort was made to prepare legislation. It was submitted in an informal manner to the gathering of the majority last week, and evidently did not receive the approval of that majority.

All during the preparation of this legislation I have tried to follow the views of the majority of my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee rather than my personal judgment. I have not approved of the so-called consumption tax. I have not approved of the cash bonus payments to the soldiers as called for in the bills which we have been considering. I think my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee will bear out the statement that I have been for most of the time in a hopeless minority as a member of the committee. I have approved of an effort to make fair compensation settlement with the veterans of the war through a certificate payment which, in a sense, is a paid-up endowment life insurance policy. In the end it would cost the Government more than a cash bonus, but it would be better for the Government and better for the men. It would extend the burden of payment by the Government over a period of 20 years and would encourage the men in the exercise of thrift.

I have no doubt that a very great majority of the ex-service men themselves favor the payment of a cash bonus, but they do it, in a sense, thoughtlessly. They do not take into consideration the results sure to follow this enormous cash payment. Why, if you approach a man and say, "Would you like \$500 free for yourself for the asking?" of course he would like it; but those men were loyal, patriotic servants of this Government under the flag, and they are just as loyal citizens to-day, and they do not want to inflict on this Government any form of taxation which will depreciate the value of the dollar, which will reduce production in this country or inflate prices. That is their test of loyalty to-day, and I appeal to these men to look at the question from the broad standpoint of their American citizenship, not from the viewpoint of the selfish individual benefits of placing in their pockets for the moment a comparatively small sum of money. Their services were patriotic, their reward not measured by dollars. The dollar mark must not be put against their patriotism, their valor, or their sacrifices. Such services as they rendered must not be commercialized, and I again appeal to them not to accept any payment that would carry with it the appearance of a cash settlement. This country, I am convinced, can not stand more taxes than it is now

burdened with. We can sugar-coat the taxation pill in any way we may, but nevertheless the bitterness of the consumption will come back to the people. They are the ones that will pay the bill. You can not get up a subterfuge form of taxation that will not eventually come back on the people, and until the financial condition of this country is very much better than it is to-day, until our receipts are more than our disbursements, the country can not stand it.

Although I have received many petitions from the American Legion posts and other organizations of veterans in favor of the bonus, I have also received many individual letters from veterans in opposition to it. I am confident that when gatherings of veterans study this question from the broad viewpoint of the best interest of the country they will realize that an additional tax burden of nearly two billions of dollars should not be asked for at the present time. [Applause.]

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. Reserving the right to object, I did not know that the gentleman from Massachusetts was going to speak out of order or I would have objected. But having permitted him to proceed out of order, when it was understood that, having given wide latitude to general debate, we would proceed with the bill under the five-minute rule without discussing other matters, I shall not object to the gentleman from Oklahoma proceeding. It is important that we pass this bill at a very early date if we are going to get through with the program. I hope there will be no further requests of this kind, because it is embarrassing to me. I do not want to object, but I do want to get along with the bill.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I say a word before the gentleman from Oklahoma begins?

Mr. McKEOWN. I will yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. I had not understood that there was any direct agreement as to the five-minute rule. I also felt that the item of war-risk insurance being before the committee that I was, in a large sense, in order. I do not wish to intrude upon any arrangement that has been made.

Mr. MADDEN. Regardless of any arrangement that is the rule of the House.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, early in the session it occurred to me that this question of legislation for a bonus for the soldiers would be eventually brought to the attention of the House and that it would be a very troublesome subject when it did come up. I think whatever legislation is agreed on by this House, it ought to be legislation that will encourage economy and industry upon the part of the discharged soldiers. I believe that if this Government will enter into an arrangement by which young men who find themselves in straitened financial conditions can obtain a loan by which they can get into some business for themselves that the Government is not going to lose much on the wind-up.

So far as the home-ownership proposition is concerned, that is good for the everyday citizen, because the very thing that is threatening the Government to-day is the discontent of men who are without homes and who are not tied to this country.

The encouragement of a citizen to own his home is good legislation. It ought to be encouraged, and not merely because he is a returned soldier, but because it is good policy for the Government, for the future welfare of the country. It is an important question whether America is to become a land of home owners or tenants. [Applause.] Wherever the tenants are congregated you have there some men who are liable to explode whenever any crisis comes upon the country. If you want to find where we have had the most trouble during the war you will find it where men have lived under undesirable conditions.

You talk about men leaving the farm. Of course, they are going to leave the farm. We ought to have some legislation that will encourage the returned soldier to remain on the farm, so that he will not leave the farm for more inviting prospects in the city.

Now, the question comes up about procuring the money for this legislation. I want to say to you that the American taxpayer is going to call a halt when you undertake to raise taxes higher than they are now. What is the hue and cry that you hear from every man who pays taxes? The hue and cry is that Congress should reduce the taxes and not raise taxes. You have loaned \$10,000,000,000 to the Allies, the income of which will be \$450,000,000 per annum when it is paid. Why put the taxation for this soldiers' relief legislation on the American people? You

create the machinery by which the young men who returned from foreign wars are to be taken care of, but what is the necessity of putting the taxation immediately on business and stifling the business of this country? Why not make a program by which the interest on the foreign loans can be applied when it comes in? It will bring in nearly a billion dollars if paid in full this fall. Why not arrange the machinery by which you can put the same in effect, so that the service men will know that the Congress has provided for them, and that Congress is willing to do what is fair by them and at the same time not make them unpopular in their neighborhoods because of the levying of obnoxious consumption taxes for their benefit? Why not arrange our legislation so as to apply it to that purpose whenever it is collected? It will be collected. This interest on the foreign loans for two years is due and should be paid. Without the valor, without the bravery, of these soldiers, the \$10,000,000,000, the amount of our foreign loans, would not amount to anything. You can take five years' interest of these foreign loans and apply it as it comes in to this relief program and it will take care of the home ownership and such things made necessary by soldiers' relief legislation. Apply it as it comes in without burdening the American taxpayer with additional taxes. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Medical and hospital services: For medical, surgical, and hospital services, medical examinations, funeral expenses, traveling expenses, and supplies, for beneficiaries of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, including court costs and other expenses incident to proceedings heretofore or hereafter taken for commitment of mentally incompetent persons to hospitals for the care and treatment of the insane, \$46,000,000. This appropriation shall be disbursed by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and such portion thereof as may be necessary shall be allotted from time to time to the Public Health Service and the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and transferred to their credit for disbursement by them for the purposes set forth in this paragraph. The allotments to the said board of managers shall also include such sums as may be necessary to alter or improve existing facilities in the several branches under its jurisdiction so as to provide adequate accommodations for such beneficiaries of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance as may be committed to its care.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman from Iowa a question with reference to that portion of this section which provides that the money shall be disbursed by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and allotted from time to time to the Public Health Service and the board of managers for the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BEE. What does the gentleman mean by the Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers? Are those the homes provided for soldiers of the Civil War?

Mr. GOOD. They were established after the Civil War, but those homes are now available for soldiers of all wars.

Mr. BEE. And they are being used now for soldiers of the recent war?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. Soldiers of the recent war to the number of 200 are in one of those homes; I think it is at the Dayton Home.

Mr. BEE. Heretofore those homes have been cared for by separate appropriations?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. There are appropriations for each of the homes carried in the bill.

Mr. BEE. I was trying to get at how much of the \$46,000,000 to be used in this paragraph will be diverted into these homes away from the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

Mr. GOOD. The bill carries in other provisions appropriations for each home sufficient to take care of each home for the next fiscal year on the basis of their membership. There are between nine and ten thousand vacant beds, and it was thought wise to make those beds available for the soldiers of this war.

Mr. BEE. That is, in these homes the gentleman speaks of?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. Just in proportion that the Director of the War Risk Insurance sends soldiers for treatment to these homes, he will have to allot sums to take care of them, because the other appropriations are estimated for upon the present membership only.

Mr. BEE. I am very glad to get that information.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I want to congratulate the Committee on Appropriations upon this very wise provision. We have had a number of extensive hearings before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with reference to hospital facilities for the men who returned from the recent war disabled and diseased. We find that the Director of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance under the present law—and I think very wisely—is charged with the sole responsibility of providing the necessary hospital facilities for these men. The question arises where he shall find the necessary buildings and institutions. This appropriation will permit him to make the proper arrangements anywhere where he can find such facilities,

and particularly authorizes him to make such arrangements with the Public Health Service and the Board of Managers of the National Homes. We are informed that the Public Health Service has some hospitals and other buildings in view which will be acquired for this purpose. We have also learned that the National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers are available for the care of some of these men. Some changes will have to be made, some alterations installed in the present buildings, and some additional facilities provided, but the hearings before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds convinced me, and I think have convinced the committee, that the present arrangement is not only wise but entirely necessary at this time. There are particularly two classes of patients who have returned from this war who appeal to all of those who have become familiar with conditions that have arisen as a result of the war. Those are patients suffering from tuberculosis and from various mental disorders. The gas attacks during the war produced an alarming number of tuberculosis cases, which are developing from time to time and doubtless will continue to develop for years yet to come. The tremendous artillery fire of this war produced an unusual number of mental disorders, some of rather extraordinary character, which sometimes do not appear at once, but frequently develop at later periods. We must expect a very large increase, in consequence of this war, of men who are suffering from tuberculosis and from mental diseases, who will require the care of their Government. As was stated a moment ago by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], no greater duty has fallen upon the people of this country and upon the Congress representing the people than to take care of those men who took their lives in their hands to serve their Government in the hour of national distress, and who have now returned home shattered in body and in mind. [Applause.]

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question in regard to the term "Independent Treasury," which occurs on line 16, page 21. That is a term that has been used for some time and I am wondering what the exact definition of it is, or at least the application of the word "independent." My understanding is that it embraces practically all of the fiscal arrangements of the Government outside of the District of Columbia, including subtreasuries, depositories, and activities of that kind, but I would like to be clear on the point because it is rather a singular term.

Mr. GOOD. My understanding of the term relates to subtreasuries and depositories as provided for by law, other than the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. HICKS. If the subtreasuries are to be abolished, as the law provides, would not that then do away with the term "Independent Treasury"?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know; I would have to look up the question myself to find out its ramifications and just the branches of the Treasury to which that relates. Of course, the subtreasuries will not be entirely abolished until the end of the next fiscal year. This heading has been carried in the bill for a long time; it is a term that has grown up in the service, and my information is that it attaches not only to subtreasuries but to the other special depositories of the Government.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph carries \$46,000,000, the item just ahead of it carries in the neighborhood of \$150,000,000, and there are other items in the bill carrying appropriations which I think bring the total appropriations for the benefit of those who were injured or who became diseased in the late war up to in the neighborhood of \$300,000,000. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. GOOD. Two hundred and eighty-two million five hundred thousand dollars in four items.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I think there are some other items.

Mr. GOOD. There are some other items that are directly chargeable to the war that would perhaps bring the amount up to the sum the gentleman has indicated.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This is purely for the benefit of men who were in the war who became diseased or were injured in the service.

I think that is a considerably larger sum than was ever appropriated at any one time in any one year to all those who served in the Civil War during a war that lasted four years when there were a great many more soldiers both injured and diseased than as a result of the recent war. I am not complaining of these appropriations. It seems to me it would hardly be charged that Congress has been niggardly in the consideration of our obligations toward the soldiers of the recent war when within two years of the actual expiration of the war, before it has theoretically expired at all, we are appropriating more money for those who were injured or dis-

eased during the war, and a short war, as far as we are concerned, than was ever appropriated for any one year for all of those of like condition during the Civil War, and more money, I believe, than the entire cost of operating the Government, including all those payments right after the Civil War. The number of men who were in actual conflict was no greater and not so great in the recent war as in the Civil War. The length of conflict was not nearly so great, yet we are frequently told that we are not beginning to do what we ought to do for the men who came out of the recent war. Maybe that is true; I will not undertake to argue that at this time. We are doing a great deal more than anybody dreamed of doing a few years ago, and I expect fully as much as anybody a few years hereafter will think there was cause for doing at this time for those who were injured and diseased. Now, we are told that we must not only do that, but we must take care of those who had a great experience and came back sound and well.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The reference to the number of soldiers injured in the Civil War brings to my mind some figures. The most reliable statements I have been able to secure show that 110,000 soldiers on the Union side in the Civil War were killed or mortally wounded in battle; 249,000 died from disease during the period of the war, making 359,000 in all. Add to that those who returned with disabilities. Take into account the total number of enlisted men in that war and over against that note these figures: In the recent World War we are told by those who have investigated the subject in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and the Public Health Service that 641,000 were discharged with some measure of disability; about 155,000 have been examined by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and found entitled to hospitalization. About 39,000 have already received treatment; 13,247, on April 7, 1920, were in the institutions under the control of the Public Health Service; tuberculosis cases indicated by the examinations in the report, 15,528; mental troubles, 15,044, 5,000 of whom are already receiving treatment under Government service. General disability cases, 81,951.

I will not consume more time at present in rehearsing these facts. There are long lists of figures opening up this wonderful story and pointing out our responsibility. In a few days I hope that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will be able to bring before the House a bill that will enable us to review in brief time the main parts of this story. Let me call attention to the two lines mentioned by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM], who is also a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds engaged in the investigation of this work. The two classes of patients that appealed to me with greatest force are those afflicted with mental troubles and tuberculosis. Here are cases that will be large in number, serious in character, laying upon the Government a very heavy responsibility, which, of course, we will all be ready to meet promptly and readily as soon as exact measures can be determined. I believe that your Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has already covered the case with sufficient investigation to disclose the material facts which we hope to bring before the House in the near future.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS OBJECTS, TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use for, and in connection with, the enforcement of the laws relating to the Treasury Department and the several branches of the public service under its control, not exceeding at any one time four persons paid from the appropriation for the collection of customs, four persons paid from the appropriation for salaries and expenses of internal-revenue agents or for the appropriation for the foregoing purpose, and four persons paid from the appropriation for suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes, but not exceeding six persons so detailed shall be employed at any one time hereunder: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to deprive the Secretary of the Treasury from making any detail now otherwise authorized by existing law.

Contingent expenses, Independent Treasury: For contingent expenses under the requirements of section 3653 of the Revised Statutes, for the collection, safe-keeping, transfer, and disbursement of the public money, transportation of notes, bonds, and other securities of the United States, salaries of special agents, actual expenses of examiners detailed to examine the books, accounts, and money on hand at the several subtreasuries and depositories, including national banks acting as depositories under the requirements of section 3649 of the Revised Statutes, also including examinations of cash account at mints, and cost of insurance on shipments of money by registered mail when necessary, \$160,000.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa with reference to this provision, page 21, enforcement of laws relating to the Treasury Department and the detailing of persons for the purpose of suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes. Now, what I would like to understand—

Mr. GOOD. We have not reached that item.

Mr. BEE. Page 21 says, "And four persons paid from the appropriation for suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes." What character of appropriation is that? Is not the general suppression of counterfeiting under the general administration of the Department of Justice through the marshal's office?

Mr. GOOD. It gives the Secretary of the Treasury authority to make the special-agent force a little more mobile.

Mr. BEE. I want to understand how it is of any value to take four persons out of the Treasury Department of the United States to investigate counterfeiting.

Mr. GOOD. While this paragraph authorizes the use of certain special agents, it is also restrictive by designating the number which may be so used.

Mr. BEE. I notice here that it says, "That nothing herein contained shall be construed to deprive the Secretary of the Treasury from making any detail now otherwise authorized by existing law." It struck me as a rather peculiar provision to take four men out of the Treasury Department to suppress counterfeiting.

Mr. GOOD. I do not know that there is any necessity for that now. Some years ago it was found they were using some of the Secret Service operatives for purposes other than the suppression of counterfeiting, and this was put on to stop that practice.

Mr. BEE. I thought the suppressing of counterfeiting was under the general administration of the Department of Justice.

Mr. GOOD. No; we have also a large appropriation for that. We carry \$325,000 in the next item for suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. JUUL. How long has the item, or the matter from lines 1 to 15, been carried in the general law? Is this new matter?

Mr. GOOD. No; it has been carried for some time. I could not tell the gentleman, but it is at least 8 or 10 years.

The Clerk read as follows:

Money-laundry machines: For all miscellaneous expenses in connection with the installation and maintenance of money-laundry machines, including repairs and purchase of supplies for machines in the District of Columbia and in the various Subtreasury offices, \$500.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the chairman advise us what is meant by these money-laundry machines?

Mr. GOOD. After the currency becomes soiled, if it is in good condition otherwise, it can be returned either to the Treasury or some of the Subtreasuries and laundered.

Mr. BLANTON. And put back into circulation?

Mr. GOOD. Put back into circulation without the necessity of having it destroyed and issuing new currency in lieu of it.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it economical to so launder it and put it back rather than to print new duplicates of it?

Mr. GOOD. That has been the judgment of the Treasury Department, that they could more economically launder some of the currency if it is not mutilated.

Mr. BLANTON. Is this item all the expense connected therewith?

Mr. GOOD. No. This is merely miscellaneous expense. The other expense is carried in the legislative bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes: For expenses incurred under the authority or with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury in detecting, arresting, and delivering into the custody of the United States marshal having jurisdiction dealers and pretended dealers in counterfeit money and persons engaged in counterfeiting Treasury notes, bonds, national bank notes, and other securities of the United States and of foreign Governments, as well as the coins of the United States and of foreign Governments, and other felonies committed against the laws of the United States relating to the pay and bounty laws, and for the enforcement of section 18 of the War Finance Corporation act; hire and operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary; per diem in lieu of subsistence, when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and for no other purpose whatever, except in the protection of the person of the President and the members of his immediate family and of the person chosen to be President of the United States, \$325,000: *Provided*, That no part of this amount shall be used in defraying the expenses of any person subpoenaed by the United States courts to attend any trial before a United States court or preliminary examination before any United States commissioner, which expenses shall be paid from the appropriation for "Fees of witnesses, United States courts": *Provided further*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a compensation greater than that allowed by law, except not exceeding three persons, who may be paid not exceeding \$12 per day.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, in line 3 I move to strike out "\$325,000" and insert "\$375,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment which the clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Good: Page 24, line 3, strike out the figures "\$325,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$375,000."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The committee had already recommended an increase of \$50,000 in this appropriation over the current law. This makes it \$100,000.

Mr. GOOD. The current law, with the deficiency, was \$325,000, just as we had. I will explain to the gentleman the reason for it. Since writing up this bill the head of the secret service in the Treasury Department has discovered that there are two counterfeits of war savings stamps that are being circulated now. I have a set of those counterfeits here, with a set of the originals, and it is a matter that is so serious that I suppose nothing has given the Treasury Department more anxiety than those counterfeits of the war savings stamps. They are so perfect that the postmasters who are under the law given authority to redeem these war savings stamps can not tell which is the genuine and which is the counterfeit. A person desiring to surrender or cash his war savings stamps is now required to give 10 days' notice, and the department proposes because of the serious consequences that would follow this effort to require the person who desires to cash his war savings stamps to deposit them with the department and let them submit them to their experts. They will have to have experts in the larger cities, and they have felt there is no other way in which they can protect the Treasury of the United States in the redemption of millions of dollars of these war savings stamps. There [exhibiting] is the genuine stamp, and there [exhibiting] is a counterfeit stamp. The gentleman, I am sure, would hardly be able to determine, if I had not told him, which was the counterfeit and which was the genuine. The counterfeit has been splendidly executed, and Mr. Moran says that unless he has this additional fund—and the Secretary of the Treasury also says so—he can not protect the holders of these certificates and the taxpayers in this regard. I will say to the gentleman that he wanted more money than my amendment calls for, but it seemed to me it was of that serious character, dealing with a pretty important matter—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I think the excuse given was a very good one.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I would like to ask the gentleman if he really feels that this increase of \$50,000 for the purposes stated will be sufficient for this service?

Mr. GOOD. It is very hard to say.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman recalls that the original estimate was for \$400,000. The committee cut that estimate to \$325,000, and since that time this trouble to which the gentleman refers has arisen. I understood the chief of the secret service to insist that he would really need the full amount of the original estimate in order to cope with this trouble which threatens to cost the Government many thousands of dollars.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that when Mr. Moran called this matter to my attention he suggested \$400,000. I did not have time to take it up with the gentleman from Tennessee, but I thought the additional \$50,000 would give him an amount that would permit him to get his force organized, and, if it was necessary for him to have additional funds, he could get them.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I may be mistaken, but I understood it was thought he would need \$75,000 instead of \$50,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CUSTOMS SERVICE.

For collecting the revenue from customs, including not exceeding \$200,000 for the detection and prevention of frauds upon the customs revenue, \$10,300,000: *Provided*, That not more than one appraiser for the port of Baltimore shall be paid from this appropriation.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARNER: At the end of line 6, page 25, strike out the period and insert: "*Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury in the expenditure of this sum shall allot to the customs districts of the United States on the Mexican border such amounts as will enable those districts to perform adequately the duties authorized and required by law."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. GARNER. I do not think it is subject to a point of order, but it may be. If it is, I want to suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that this amendment only directs the Secretary of the Treasury to do now what he ought to do, to wit, enforce the customs laws along the border of Mexico.

There is \$10,300,000 appropriated for this purpose in this bill, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury. There was \$10,000,000 last year. Three hundred and fifty thousand dollars of it was used for the purpose of enforcing the customs laws along the 1,800 miles of border of this country. I do not believe it sufficient; I do not think the Congress would believe it sufficient if it had all the facts before it. I offer this amendment in order that we may suggest to the Secretary of the Treasury that he use sufficient of this appropriation to adequately enforce the customs laws along the border of Mexico.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not know whether the Secretary of the Treasury would take the opportunity—I would not be surprised if he would—and thereupon ask Congress to give him four or five million dollars more in order to guard the coast of Mexico, the coast of Florida, the Canadian border, and various seacoasts of the United States with extra officials in order to prevent the importation of liquor into the United States. It may be proper to do that. I am not anxious myself to give the Secretary of the Treasury, under the collection of import duties—and there is still a duty on liquor, although we have forbidden its importation into the United States entirely, and it is a part of their duty to enforce that law—I am not anxious to have the Treasury Department have a line of officials standing but a very few feet apart, not only on the Mexican border but on the Canadian border, and possibly upon the seacoasts of the United States, to prevent the possible smuggling in of some liquor which ought not to be brought to the United States, and which I will not have the chance to consume, and would not if I had the chance.

Mr. GARNER. Let me say to my friend from Illinois that I am in perfect accord with his views in that particular.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is what I thought.

Mr. GARNER. So far as some of the constituents of gentlemen representing districts along our southern border are concerned, the customs laws may not be administered in such a manner as to suit them, but it is in the interest of humanity that the Treasury Department should maintain for itself a sufficient force to protect itself against the lawless element that comes in from Mexico. Recently—within the last 30 days—there have been three men killed along the border of Texas, and it can be attributed to the fact that there were not sufficient men to take care of the situation. Talk about two men going against a company of six or seven; it is very difficult, as the gentleman will realize, and their lives are constantly in jeopardy.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. We have lawlessness on both sides of the border, and no doubt men will be killed on our side of the border.

Mr. GARNER. I am not suggesting that you increase the salaries, although I do believe that the customs guards' salaries ought to be increased. I think the duty of the Treasury Department with reference to the enforcement of the liquor law on the border should be to consolidate the Internal Revenue and the Customs Services. Of course, we can not do it on this bill, but since you can not remedy the situation with reference to the internal revenue and the enforcement of the prohibition act and the Customs Service, I merely want to suggest to the Secretary of the Treasury that he furnish sufficient employees along that border in order adequately to enforce the law. I hope the gentleman from Illinois will not make a point of order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, here comes a matter where the gentleman wants to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to do something that I take it he would have the power to do now.

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not believe there is any instance where, when that was done, the executive or administrative officials did not at once, or as soon as they could, say they would do this, but that they would have to have more money to do it with.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman will understand that in this particular item there was \$1,700,000 asked for in excess of what was given to them. They were given \$10,300,000, which was only \$300,000 more than they received last year.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Then they would come back and say, "You have directed us to do so-and-so, and we must have the money."

Mr. GARNER. They may say that, but I do not think it will have much weight with the committee or with the Congress.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I noticed this morning, a while ago, that the Democrats of the House, together with a few Republicans of the House, were able to put an increased item over.

Mr. GARNER. I was not in the Chamber, and the gentleman must not shake his gory locks at me. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That thing frequently occurs. If the gentleman from Texas leads an assault upon the Treasury his colleagues will join him, and possibly some of the Members on this side, in the crusade against liquor. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARNER. I am perfectly willing to take the chastisement of the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I am speaking of these unholy combinations of all the Democrats with a few Republicans to loot the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] think that he ought to object to this indictment by Democratic Members of the Democratic administration? [Laughter.] You folks on the Democratic side resent it if on this side we call attention to the mismanagement and maladministration of public affairs; but when Democrats rise in their places and find it necessary to add to appropriation bills amendments to the effect that in expending an appropriation the administration shall comply with the law and protect the public interest—when they themselves feel called upon to do that, why should we object? [Laughter.]

It is a serious indictment. We have come to a pretty pass in the administration of the Government when gentlemen on the Democratic side would have us tag onto the end of every appropriation item a specific direction that in expending the money the department officials have a regard for the interests of the people and properly enforce the laws of the land. Do the gentlemen on that side want to tag appropriations with that kind of a provision? If they do, for my part I shall not object. I do not think we should object on this side.

Mr. GARNER. I am very glad to have the gentleman from Wyoming indorse the amendment, and I hope it will pass now. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Of course, as a general rule the gentleman from Texas never yields anything to this side of the House and gets everything he wants, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order.

Mr. GARNER. Question! Go ahead and put the question. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise in opposition to the general provisions of this paragraph, but to call the attention of the House to the fact that a most worthy class of employees in the Customs Service, namely, the customs clerks, are not to receive a well-deserved recognition in the way of increased compensation because of the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury, in submitting his estimates to our committee, neglected to provide for such increase. These clerks recently banded themselves together to promote in all legitimate ways the welfare of the members and the efficiency of the service. They are not affiliated with any organization outside the Government service, and I mention this latter fact because I have been asked to bring it to the attention of Congress.

These clerks did not consider it wise or patriotic to make a general request for increased compensation during the war, at a time when every dollar of the revenues of the country was needed for the successful prosecution of that war. [Applause.] Of course, they were made uneasy in those days when they saw the various Government departments, and especially the newly created and expanded war bureaus, taking on employees at much higher initial salaries than long-experienced employees in the Customs Service are now receiving.

The Government showed its realization of the situation by giving a so-called bonus, first of 5 or 10 per cent, according to basic salary, then \$120 per annum flat, then \$240 per annum flat, which is now being received. It is obvious that under present conditions this bonus is only a slight mitigation of the serious economic situation which confronts practically every class of the customs employees of the country in view of the increased cost of living of about 100 per cent in the past five years. What is a man with a family dependent upon him to do in such circumstances? First, he may resign to seek other and more lucrative employment. This is being done in too many cases for the good of the service. But work in the Customs Service is of such a specialized nature that training and experience gained there are not particularly available in commercial

lines. Second, he may obtain employment outside of office hours, which, however, are not so arranged as to make this means of increasing income possible in many cases, and when it is done it is likely to be at the expense of the health and strength of the employee who is supposed to give his whole energy to the work of the office in which he is employed. Third, he may consume past savings in the present support of his family; or, finally, he may reduce his standard of living. This is of necessity the plan adopted by the majority of customs employees.

I want to say to the House that, inasmuch as the manner of living of these customs employees in the best of days can not be lavish, any reduction in the standard of living necessitated by present conditions will not make for the contentment of the men or the morale of the service. These men realize fully the great cost of the war, and that the cost must be paid by the people of this country. They expect to pay their share of the economic loss [applause], and they are not complaining of paying even more than that share; but they do feel that the time has come when the disparity between their income and that received in other and less responsible lines of duty outside the Customs Service should be lessened.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the House the conditions as they exist among the 398 employees in the collector's division at the port of Boston, and I am not including the appraiser's force. Among the various classes there are 14 officials and deputy collectors. There are also 112 customs inspectors, and others who are paid at a per diem rate. This leaves 272 civil-service employees directly in charge of Collector Edmund Billings, who, I might add, has stirred my interest in these men, who are paid yearly salaries amounting to \$364,605, which is an average of \$1,340.46 per annum, or \$111.70 per month.

Out of a total of 525 civil-service employees in the collector's and appraiser's division, there are 228 who receive \$1,200 or less; in other words, 43.4 per cent of all the employees receive \$100 per month or less.

May I remind the House that the men in whose behalf I appeal, most of whom are married, secured their positions by competitive examinations? They are skilled and trained men. Twenty of them have been forced recently to accept outside positions in order to secure increased wages, and I fear that many more of these valuable public servants will be compelled to leave the Customs Service if conditions are not improved. I regret to say that the men who are leaving are among the best and the youngest of the clerks. You know as well as I do that when the force is depleted by the resignation of the best clerks it will cost the Government considerable to train a new force, and the business meanwhile will suffer, because it will be necessarily conducted by the less efficient and superannuated employees.

My associates on this committee were in sympathy, in some degree, with what these men are seeking and what I personally was anxious to have them receive, but the Treasury Department did not estimate for any increases for the customs clerks throughout the country, and as it is the practice of the committee not to report in its bill any appropriations which exceed the estimates asked for by the various bureaus of the Government, naturally my suggestion that these men ought to receive more money went by the board, but I have taken advantage of this opportunity to call the attention of the House to the fact that here is one important branch of the Government service where faithful employees, who did not at any time during the past four years ask for increased compensation, now feel that they ought to be considered. I agree with them, and I would like to see an amendment on this bill specifically providing for their betterment financially. I have hopes that perhaps somewhere else in this legislative system of ours some provision may be made for these men before this bill becomes a law. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

For pay, allowance, and commutation of quarters for commissioned medical officers, including the Surgeon General, assistant surgeons general at large not exceeding three in number, and pharmacists, \$856,000.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. As most of the Members of the House know, the conferees have just decided upon a report reconciling the two bills, passed by this body and the body at the other end of the Capitol, in relation to the pay of the officers and men of the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and Public Health Service. I believe that report will be before us to-morrow or the next day

for our consideration. Personally, I am very much in favor of that increase, and I merely want to make a statement now for the information of the committee in regard to the Public Health Service.

A day or two ago I made a brief speech on the subject of pay increases, in which I referred to the various arms of the service, and I merely wish to quote this from the public-health item in that speech:

THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

In October, 1918, there were in the regular corps of the Public Health Service 217 commissioned officers. Since that time there have been 4 admissions to the corps, 3 deaths, and 21 resignations. Prior to that date the Public Health Service usually obtained by admission 10 to 15 officers per year and lost practically none by resignation.

The reserve of the Public Health Service was established in October, 1918. In order to obtain medical officers for the medical care and treatment of war-risk insurance patients the service commissioned 472 reserve officers who were leaving either the Army or Navy. Of the number recruited in this way 76 have resigned. It is almost impossible to secure new recruits. The importance of this service, especially to those who wore the uniform in the recent war, should appeal to us to enact legislation for relief.

The fact that it is almost impossible to secure new recruits is due essentially to the fact that the pay of these men is not sufficient to attract them, and in reference to this Public Health Service we must consider that the men in that service are doing magnificent work for the men who wore the uniform of their country in the recent war. In addition to the Justice of the case on its own merits, that is another reason why I am in favor of an increase of pay for those men, in order that that service can be recruited up to its full strength, so that the ex-service men may receive the benefits they so rightfully deserve.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rural sanitation: For special studies of, and demonstration work in, rural sanitation, including personal services, and including not to exceed \$5,000 for the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, \$50,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for demonstration work in rural sanitation in any community unless the State, county, or municipality in which the community is located agrees to pay one-half the expense of such demonstration work.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, on page 30, line 1, by striking out "\$50,000" and inserting "\$150,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. Sisson: Page 30, line 1, strike out "\$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$150,000."

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to take this occasion to congratulate the chairman of this committee and to congratulate the full committee on the splendid work that they have done. Taking the bill as a whole, I do not think it could be improved upon, and it has my entire approval, and the only item to which I made any objection was the reduction by the committee of the amount which I have offered to increase by this amendment.

The department asked for \$250,000 for this purpose. Now, I am sure that all the members of the committee know that I am deeply interested in this item, because I was instrumental in getting the first appropriation for this purpose. I believe that of all the times in the history of the Government when we ought to economize this is the most urgent. I congratulate every Member of Congress who is advocating, standing for, and voting for economy; but there are wise expenditures of money that may result in the greatest economy.

In view of the fact that the great problem confronting us now is that of an ample supply of food, and since all the food must come from the farms, whatever this Congress can do within its proper constitutional power to aid and assist in making farm life more attractive, it is our duty to do. In addition to that I think it is the greatest economy.

It has been estimated by the authorities that something like \$1,000,000,000 is lost each year, counting the number of days that men are out of employment by virtue of sickness due to preventable diseases. Now, there are five diseases which cause something like 70 per cent of the sickness in the United States. These five diseases are preventable. They can be controlled absolutely by sanitation. I will not go into a discussion of all of them, but take the single horrible disease of typhoid fever. It is known that this disease can be communicated from one person to another only through and by means of human feces, as repugnant as the idea may be, unless taken through

the mouth. In the sanitation of our homes throughout the country it is easy for men to make the fatal mistake of putting their toilets in their gardens, where they ought not to be. It is easy to put them where the drainage will go into gardens or into pastures where cattle drink the water. I imagine no one will deny the proposition that the greatest handicap we all suffer to-day is the handicap of ignorance. The wise and well-informed man in building his premises, if he has kept up with modern laws of sanitation, does not need instruction. This appropriation was increased to \$150,000 the year we got into the war. They asked then for \$250,000. When Mr. Fitzgerald was chairman of the committee, I got them to report an appropriation of \$150,000, but before this appropriation was used the war broke out, and then all of this money was used in those counties contiguous to the camps and cantonments to make healthy the places where we were training our boys. The next year they were given \$150,000, and the money was used in the same way. Therefore the people have not had the benefit of this appropriation. It was diverted. Now, this year the committee have recommended only \$50,000, thus reducing the amount \$100,000. Now, this money is perfectly safeguarded by the proviso. They can not get a dollar of this money until the local authorities have put up as many dollars. If you want to do something that in my judgment is practical and economical, to say nothing of the relief that you give by removing the causes of diseases that produce 70 per cent of the sickness in the United States, which all the authorities, bacteriologists as well as physicians, say are absolutely preventable, then I ask you, gentlemen, to vote for this amendment.

You may say that the State ought to do it, but the trouble is that the county or State, those portions where they need it the most, will be the place where they resist it the most and are least able to pay. This is for the purpose of aiding the people to realize that by proper sanitation they may relieve themselves of doctors' bills and the suffering of the sick bed. [Applause.]

In addition to that, no city can be safe. Do not lay the flattering unction to your souls that because you live in the city you are not subject to the same sort of infection that the man is who lives in the country. Because all the vegetables that are eaten raw, all the milk that goes into the great cities to feed babies, that you drink yourselves, come from the farm; and when we know with absolute certainty that by proper sanitation you can prevent diseases being communicated in that way it does seem as if Congress should be willing not to stand in its own light, but to give this pitiable sum for dispensing this information.

You say that States ought to do it. Why do you maintain the health department; why do you spend such large sums on that? Look at this small item, even if you make it \$150,000. Look at the sums that you give to look after the health of soldiers. I am not complaining about that; but if you would complete a proper system of sanitation you will find that you may be able to reduce the other appropriations very much more than you would spend by giving the people the proper information as to these communicable diseases. [Applause.]

So if I wanted to sustain this item as a humanitarian I could call attention to the suffering on the beds of illness throughout this country, and if I could cause men to believe and know that the failure on the part of Congress to appropriate \$100,000 more than you are giving here would relieve the heart-aches and suffering I do not believe that a single Member of Congress would decline to vote for the appropriation.

Ignorance of disease is what causes most diseases. Ignorance of how to take care of the health is what causes most all ill health throughout the country. So you can confer, in my judgment, great benefit on the people as a matter of cold-blooded economy estimated at about a billion dollars. When you take into consideration the doctors' bills and the suffering, you can not measure that in dollars and cents.

If this is true, the only thing necessary to convince you is whether or not the expenditure of the money will tend to do that. If I could convince every Member of Congress that the microscope and bacteriological investigations have been able to isolate all the germs that produce these five diseases with which the people are afflicted and that they can be prevented, then surely no one would oppose this increase. It seems to me that we are making progress along the right lines, not in curing the diseases but in preventing the diseases.

Every county health officer who has had an opportunity to see this trial without exception says that this is the best money expended in the United States, and I hope, gentlemen, that you will vote, with all of these other millions that you are expending for the purpose of making health laws, building new hospitals, and developing the great health department of the

Government—that you will do this much to give the people throughout the country the information that they need to assist in protecting them from disease, and a protection which will make healthier, stronger, better, and safer all the people who live in the country. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, no one will deny that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] is one of the real economists of the House. He is a very valuable Member of this House. No one has contributed more by hard work and industry to bring about real economy in Government expenditures than has the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson]. He has given of his time and strength at all times to bringing about results. But, like the rest of us, he has his fads. He has not many, but he has one, and that fad is rural sanitation. It stands and abides with him.

We are all in favor of public health. We want to see a good state of public health all over the United States, but I am afraid we are not getting very far with an appropriation of this kind. I am perfectly willing to continue the work with the amount that we carry in the bill to see whether or not the public service can really accomplish something along the line that the gentleman from Mississippi has indicated that he wants to accomplish. In 1916 and 1917, during both of those years, when the gentleman's side of the House was in control, they appropriated \$25,000. Then came the war, and you appropriated \$150,000, and a large part of that was used because of sanitary conditions around the camps. Last year for a peace-time program you appropriated \$50,000, and we have carried in this bill the same amount. I submit to the gentleman from Mississippi that after all this is an experiment.

Mr. SISSON. As a matter of fact, the estimate for the last appropriation was \$500,000.

Mr. GOOD. The last estimate was \$500,000, the same as the estimate for this year.

Mr. SISSON. I will state to my friend that every time the item has been refused by the committee it has met my vigorous protest.

Mr. GOOD. I know that it has. If the result which the gentleman desires, if we could reduce the death rate by a simple appropriation of \$100,000 or \$500,000, that would be worth while to make the appropriation. But I am afraid we are not getting very far. What is the program? It is to allot about \$8,000 to a county. So far as it has been applied, wherever studies and surveys have been made, they have not been followed by the adjoining county at all. The money spent in the county, with the expenditure of Government funds, the rest of the counties do not take up the rural sanitation as advocated by the Public Health Service.

I am afraid that a good deal of the money we are carrying here in this respect is going to be wasted, but because of the fact that it is to produce a better condition with regard to the health of the rural part of our country, it seemed to the committee wise to carry the appropriation that is carried for the current year for a little while longer, to see whether or not something that is worth while can be accomplished. I do not believe that we should increase the amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

BOARD OF MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION.

For commissioner, \$7,500; assistant commissioner, \$5,000; necessary and proper expenses incurred in connection with any arbitration or with the carrying on of the work of mediation and conciliation, including rent in the District of Columbia, traveling and other necessary expenses of members or employees of boards of arbitration, furniture, office fixtures and supplies, books of reference and periodicals, salaries, traveling expenses, and other necessary expenses of members or employees of the Board of Mediation and Conciliation, to be approved by the chairman of said board, \$22,500; in all, \$35,000.

Authority for incurring expenses, including subsistence, by boards of arbitration shall first be obtained from the Board of Mediation and Conciliation.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, on page 31 and page 32, by striking out all of the language commencing on line 17, page 31, down to and including line 6, on page 32.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment, that that part of it which relates to lines 17 to 25, inclusive, on page 31, and lines 1 to 3, inclusive, on page 32 comes too late, in that the paragraph containing it had been passed and that the Clerk had already read lines 4, 5, and 6, a new paragraph, on page 32. The gentleman's amendment comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was on his feet seeking recognition when the Clerk began the reading

of the paragraph beginning on line 4, and the Chair thinks it would be unfair to apply the rule strictly in the present instance.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman did not call on the Chairman until after the Clerk had finished the reading of lines 4, 5, and 6, which form an entirely new paragraph, on page 32.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman is entitled to recognition. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASEY: Page 31, beginning on line 17, strike out all of line 17 down to line 25, inclusive, and all of lines 1 to 6, inclusive, on page 32.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, this item carries an appropriation of \$35,000 for a Board of Mediation and Conciliation, as provided for in the act of July 15, 1913. I find in the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations on page 435 that Mr. William L. Chambers, a commissioner for the Board of Mediation and Conciliation, on February 10, appeared before the committee and gave testimony as to the necessity of this board. I find that on or about February 28 the Esch-Cummins railroad law was passed which provided for a labor board. Section 304 of that law provides—

That there is hereby established a board to be known as the Railroad Labor Board, and to be composed of nine members, as follows:

There is then specification as to the persons who are to constitute the board.

Section 307 of the same act provides, among other things, that the labor board shall hear and as soon as practicable, and with due diligence, try any dispute involving grievances, rules, or railroad conditions.

I also find that section 316 of the same act contains the following language:

The powers and duties of the Board of Mediation and Conciliation created by the act of July 15, 1913, shall not extend to any dispute which may be received for hearing and decision by any adjustment board or the labor board.

In the face of these facts I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or some other member of that committee what are the duties of this board provided for in the bill now under consideration?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this board was established in 1913. Just what the conflict, if any, will be between the Board of Mediation and Conciliation and the Railway Labor Board provided for in the transportation act it is difficult to say. We took up with this Board of Mediation and Conciliation the matter of whether or not there was going to be any conflict. The chairman of the board, Mr. Chambers, said that there would be no conflict, and subsequently wrote a letter, in which he said:

It is possible that during the coming fiscal year some controversies, which might under the Newlands law come to an arbitration board appointed for that particular purpose, may be taken under the jurisdiction of the Railroad Labor Board provided for in the transportation act. The members of the Board of Mediation and Conciliation can not attempt to foretell just what course a railroad labor dispute will take before a satisfactory settlement is reached, but should a controversy of some magnitude or several cases of smaller proportions be referred by the parties to arbitration under the act of July 15, 1913, providing for mediation, conciliation, and arbitration of railroad labor controversies, the Board of Mediation and Conciliation might be compelled to appeal to Congress for a deficiency appropriation should the suggested reductions in the appropriations for 1921 be put into effect.

My understanding of the situation is this, and I am very frank to say that it is somewhat superficial. This Board of Mediation and Conciliation, given the jurisdiction to conciliate disputes that arise between railroad companies and their employees, have some powers with regard to conciliation not given to the labor board.

The committee has kept in mind the gentleman's viewpoint, that Congress has already reduced appropriations with regard to conciliation in labor disputes—and that question was raised by others—and we did not want to take the responsibility for cutting out an appropriation and destroying the usefulness of a board that might by its activities bring about a state of harmony and peace between the employer and employees in railroad transportation and thought it was best to give the reduced appropriation.

Mr. CASEY. May I ask the gentleman whether, in the face of the language contained in section 316 of the railroad act—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. The language of section 316 of the railroad act is as follows:

The powers and duties of the Board of Mediation and Conciliation created by the act approved July 15, 1913, shall not extend to any dispute which may be received for hearing or decision by any adjustment board or by the labor board.

Under that language, could the gentleman imagine any dispute on the railroads over which this Board of Mediation and Conciliation would have jurisdiction?

Mr. GOOD. I think they must have thought so, or they would have repealed this.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, does it not repeal it anyway by implication?

Mr. GOOD. The Board of Mediation and Conciliation do not understand that they have taken over their function, and I think the President does not believe that the functions of the board has been entirely taken away from them by that act.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. Yes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The only excuse for the continuation of this board is not for the purpose of settling any disputes that might arise between railroads and their employees but for the purpose of settling disputes that might arise between other activities.

Under the language of the statute the gentleman has just read I think it is a complete repeal of this law in so far as they would have any jurisdiction over disputes with railroads.

Mr. CASEY. What other activities has the gentleman in mind?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. In industrial disputes—

Mr. CASEY. Oh, no; because the Board of Mediation and Conciliation created under the act of July 15, 1913, is known as the Board of Mediation and Conciliation created by the passage of the Newlands Act, which had to do absolutely and only with railroad disputes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. If that is true, they have exceeded their authority, because they have reported hundreds of cases of conciliation that had nothing whatever to do with railroads.

Mr. CASEY. No; I think the gentleman is mistaken, because there is a division of mediation and conciliation in the Department of Labor that has to do with all industrial disputes other than railroads.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. What is the difference between that board and the board now under consideration?

Mr. CASEY. The difference is that the Division of Mediation and Conciliation in the Department of Labor does some real constructive work, while this board will do nothing but draw its salary and make financial reports to the Congress.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Then I am clearly of the opinion that if the gentleman is correct with reference to the jurisdiction that the statute he has read absolutely repeals this there is no occasion for this.

Mr. CASEY. I want to say, further, Mr. Chairman, I have read the hearings; here they are, and I think I am justified in saying it is practically only a financial report of the activities of this board. I want to say, further, that the railroad employees of the country do not recognize this board as having jurisdiction and never did recognize it to any great extent, and I am of the opinion that if we carry this item in this bill and still continue this board we are going to have a conflict of authority, and we are not going to have any centralized authority in the handling of these labor disputes, and that is essential. We must have centralized authority in the handling of those disputes. We may have decentralized administration, but when we commence to decentralize authority and decentralize administration, then you are breeding trouble and, in my opinion, that is all that this does.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I will.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There no doubt is a great deal in what the gentleman says, but I take issue with the statement that this Board of Mediation and Conciliation has done nothing more than submit financial reports to Congress.

Mr. CASEY. I did not mean to be understood as saying that; I mean after the passage of the railroad act. That is about all they can do.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, in so far as future work is concerned, there may be a good deal in what the gentleman says, but here is the situation: The transportation act, the so-called Esch law, has just been put upon the statute books and the labor board provided for under that act has just been appointed and has just taken charge—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I ask that the gentleman have two additional minutes.

Mr. CASEY. Make it five.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, while it may be true that under the transportation act, as the gentleman has said, the board will have entire control or jurisdiction of all labor disputes that may arise between the railroads and the employees, notwithstanding that, inasmuch as that board has just taken hold, does not the gentleman think that it might prove unwise without further investigation to repeal on this bill, so to speak, the law providing for this particular Board of Mediation and Conciliation?

Mr. CASEY. I will say in reply to the gentleman—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And, if the gentleman will permit me, the committee in making this appropriation did not give them the full amount that has been carried for the current year, but cut them down to the minimum.

Mr. CASEY. I will say in reply to the gentleman that if the labor board provided by the railroad act is going to be workable and amount to anything, we must centralize the authority. We must not have any conflict of authority. That is essential in all of these labor disputes, and if we provide in this bill for one board of mediation and conciliation and provide in the Esch-Cummins Act another board to handle these labor disputes, there is an opportunity of passing the buck, so to speak. [Applause.] What we want to do is to centralize authority and make those who are charged with the responsibility under law settle these cases.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield further for just one suggestion?

Mr. CASEY. I will.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There could not possibly be any conflict as I view it, but if there were any conflict between this board having only \$35,000 at its disposal to pay salaries, and so forth, and the labor board under the transportation act, then undoubtedly the labor board created under the transportation act would have the right of way, because that law has only recently been passed and would supersede any authority or jurisdiction carried in the act of 1913.

Mr. CASEY. Let me say in reply to the gentleman from Tennessee if the testimony given by Mr. Chambers is worth anything, if it is worthy of consideration at all, then we are justified in believing it would lead to a conflict of authority, because in his statement before the committee he denies the jurisdiction of the board created under the Esch-Cummins transportation law and assumes that his board of mediation and conciliation has jurisdiction in certain cases; there is a conflict right there as stated in the testimony before the committee, and I do not think that Congress should be a party to it.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. If I understand the situation, we have the railroad law just passed?

Mr. CASEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAYTON. As far as language can make it, it establishes a board for the settlement of railroad disputes?

Mr. CASEY. Of railroad disputes.

Mr. LAYTON. Of railroad disputes. In the Department of Labor we have a board for the settlement of industrial disputes?

Mr. CASEY. Yes, sir; the Division of Mediation and Conciliation.

Mr. LAYTON. Then, why in the name of common sense do we want to go to the expense of another board for any other purpose when that covers the whole ground?

Mr. CASEY. I am trying to strike it out of the bill, and I am trying to convince the Committee on Appropriations and the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union that it should go out.

Mr. LAYTON. I will vote with the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I will.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman has impressed me with the strength of the authority he shows, and unless the committee can show me there is some situation that the adjustment board does not reach I can not vote against the amendment to strike this out.

Mr. CASEY. Let me say to the gentleman in reply—not depending entirely on my own judgment in this matter—I went to the trouble this morning of going to see Mr. Shepherd, of the

railroad conductors, and other officers of these great railroad organizations, and asked this question, in the face of the language contained in the Esch-Cummins law, what jurisdiction or functions this board would have, and they said it would have absolutely none; that it is absolutely useless; and, so far as they were concerned, we could eliminate it. That is the position of the men who are supposed to use this board.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I will.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The labor board under the transportation act, as I recall, can not act except upon application. Is that correct?

Mr. CASEY. That is the labor board, but that does not prevent the other boards from acting, from which there may be an appeal to the labor board.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair would like to suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that it would clear up the parliamentary situation somewhat if his amendment concluded with line 3 on page 32.

Mr. CASEY. If that will clarify the situation, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment to that extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. To what extent?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggested to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that, technically, the Chair having held that the amendment was in order, it should end on line 3 on page 32. The Clerk had only read down to and including line 3, page 32.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, as I understand, the amendment seeks to strike out from lines 1 to 6 on page 32?

The CHAIRMAN. That was the form of the amendment, and the Chair suggested the amendment be modified so that it would include only line 3.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I was under the impression that the labor board created under the transportation act was not given authority on its own motion to enter into labor disputes or make labor investigations. It must be on application.

Mr. BLACK. My recollection of that is, if the gentleman will yield, that if an increase in wages should be given that will be sufficient to create a necessity for substantial increase in rates, then the board itself could assume jurisdiction over the dispute.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. BLACK. No; the railroad board that we speak of. In the first instance, the adjustment boards created by the men on the railroads are supposed to act, but if it comes to the knowledge of the Railroad Labor Board that the advances given by these adjustment boards are such that would probably involve a substantial increase in rates, they can assume jurisdiction, even though they may not be appealed from.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is where the adjustment board acts. The adjustment board, in the first place, can not act except upon application.

Mr. CASEY. My understanding of it is—and, of course, there are none of us who can be too certain about what the precedents will be as we go along—at this time, when a dispute arises on the railroad, the representatives of the workers and the representatives of the carriers get together with their bipartisan board, or local board. They have the right to handle the grievances as to wages, working conditions, and arrive at settlements. If they settle a controversy satisfactorily to both sides, that is the end of it, provided that the settlement will not force an increase in the freight rates, and if it does that, then the labor board can reach down and upon its own initiative take hold of the case; only in that case can they take the initiative, but the employees or railroad managers can go to the labor board from the local board.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It is very likely that in every case one of those boards will be called on. What I wanted to get at was this: Suppose there was a threatened strike on the railroads. I do not think under the law, as I recall it, the labor board has any jurisdiction except it is applied to or that the adjustment board has any jurisdiction except it is applied to. The Board of Mediation and Conciliation is a "butter in."

Mr. CASEY. I think that is the danger of the whole thing.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It may be advisable to have somebody with authority to officially "butt in." That is what I am talking about. And they have in various cases in the past, at least where strikes were threatened, tendered their services and accomplished the result of preventing a strike.

Mr. CASEY. That is true, but we did not have the board then as set up in the transportation act.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I understand, but under the transportation act is there any authority given to the board there to "butt in"?

Mr. CASEY. It is my understanding that there is.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I was under the impression they could only act upon application.

Mr. CASEY. My understanding is just the opposite.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I will.

Mr. GOOD. The labor board would take jurisdiction under dispute upon the application of 100 or more unorganized employees, but not less. Now, this board of conciliation would take cognizance of a dispute where any number of organized employees appeal for mediation.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. They do not have to appeal to the board of mediation.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; on the application of the employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, if this is a duplication of service, I am perfectly willing that it shall go out. I am not satisfied and was not satisfied at the time that it was a duplication of service. I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CASEY] if he is willing that this go over until to-morrow, until a little further investigation may be made in regard to the law? I intended to make a further investigation in regard to the transportation act and make a comparison. Then it can come up on his motion.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, that is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the item be passed, with the motion to strike out pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the paragraph beginning with line 18 on page 31, down to and including line 6, page 32, be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Reserving the right to object, am I right in understanding the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to say that he has no objection to this going out?

Mr. GOOD. If there is a conflict between this board of conciliation and the other board—

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Is not the gentleman convinced by the very clear statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CASEY], as I am convinced by the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and by reference to the various acts that we have passed creating the boards that have already been mentioned, that there really is no necessity whatever for the maintenance of the board mentioned in the bill, and that their functions have really consisted only of drawing pay and sending a report to Congress? Now, if that is the only function, and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is convinced of that, as I am convinced of it, why should we hesitate? Why should not this go out?

Mr. GOOD. I am not convinced, and I do not think the membership of the House or the gentleman from Pennsylvania would want to do anything that would require that we should back up. If this board were found to be performing a service that is done by the other body, it should go out. My only point is that we ought to make an investigation and be sure we are right before we proceed.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Can the gentleman conceive of any actual work that this board has to do that will justify its existence?

Mr. GOOD. I can conceive of some cases, if it were left in there, where the one board would not take jurisdiction of a case and where the other board would have jurisdiction.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Would not the result of such a condition as that be to shirk the responsibility and "pass the buck," as has already been suggested?

Mr. GOOD. I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the two paragraphs concerning the Board of Mediation and Conciliation, beginning on page 18 and ending with line 6 on page 32, be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, might not this circumstance exist, that the new railroad board recently created by Congress may not be empowered to take any initiative whatever; that they may be permitted to adjust differences only after the matters have been submitted to them by one or both of the contending parties, while the present board, when difficulties arise, may take the initiative themselves and go out and seek to adjust the difficulty? Might not that circumstance exist, which would cause the chairman very properly to desire time in which to look into the matter?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS.

For expenses made necessary by the act entitled "An act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts," approved May 17, 1910, including the purchase of periodicals, maps, and books of reference, to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the commission by the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds, who shall be the secretary and shall act as the executive officer of said commission, \$10,500.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say to the chairman of the committee that the act only authorizes an appropriation of \$10,000. This carries \$10,500. I would like to ask if the gentleman would not be willing to change the sum to \$10,000?

Mr. GOOD. The act only provides for \$10,000. The committee has simply reported the amount that has been carried for several years for this purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is the very reason why it should not be carried further.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will withdraw his point of order I am perfectly willing to offer an amendment reducing it to \$10,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky withdraws the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in line 14 of page 32, the figures "\$10,500" and insert the figures "\$10,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Good: Page 32, line 14, strike out the figures "\$10,500" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$10,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION.

Salaries: Three commissioners, at \$4,000 each; secretary, \$3,000; attorney, \$4,000; chief statistician, \$3,500; chief of accounts, \$2,500; assistant chief of accounts, \$1,600; accountant, \$2,250; claim examiners—chief \$2,250, assistant \$2,000, assistant \$1,800, five assistants at \$1,600 each; special agents—two at \$1,800 each, two at \$1,600 each; clerks—7 of class 3, 12 of class 2, 27 of class 1, 3 at \$1,000 each; chief telephone operator, \$1,000; messenger, \$840; experts and temporary assistants in the District of Columbia and elsewhere to be paid at a rate not exceeding \$8 per day, and temporary clerks, stenographers, or typewriters in the District of Columbia, to be paid at a rate not exceeding \$100 per month, \$10,000; in all, \$124,940.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BLANTON. How much additional compensation is embraced in this paragraph, I would like to ask the chairman?

Mr. GOOD. How much over the current law?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. The total amount carried in this bill is \$124,940, as compared with \$91,290 for the current year.

Mr. BLANTON. Then there is something like \$33,650 of increase?

Mr. GOOD. No. I should have said as compared with \$108,240. It is between \$16,000 and \$17,000 increase.

Mr. BLANTON. Between \$16,000 and \$17,000?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. There is a movement on foot now with regard to this question of increases of salary, to pay the school-teachers in the District of Columbia an additional compensation called a "bonus" to the extent of \$500. I do hope that that will pass, and I hope the chairman will permit that amendment to be offered on the bill. I intend to offer it, if no one else does, before we get through with this bill, and I hope that neither the chairman of the committee nor anyone else will make the point of order against it.

If there is any one class of employees on God's green earth that is underpaid, it is the teachers of our land, and especially the teachers in the District of Columbia. You talk about these young, unskilled girls down here who are employed in very ordinary positions in the departments, for whom we passed an

increase in appropriation this morning, receiving a little less than \$1,000 a year with their bonus, very ordinary positions, while you will find school-teachers in this District who are graduates of colleges and universities, who have been teaching here for years, who do not get more than \$1,000; people who are highly intelligent, the very best skilled teachers in the land, and we let that item pass by here every year. We have granted them a little increase, but the little increase that we have granted them does not amount to a bagatelle by the side of some of these other increases.

Why is it that we always are willing to let it pass? Why is it that we do not give them this \$500 bonus? If we are so concerned about other employees of this Government, why are we not concerned about the teachers of the District of Columbia? I hope that when the rule is brought in here that is now under contemplation, which will shortly appear from the hip pocket of the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], making in order certain items that are going to be stricken out of this bill on a point of order—I hope that when that rule is finally prepared and brought in here it will make in order this \$500 for the teachers of the District of Columbia.

This is one increase that you will find me voting for with you shoulder to shoulder, and I will even vote to increase it and enlarge it over the \$500, because I believe that every teacher in this District is entitled to it. [Applause.]

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARBOUR. Has the gentleman received a telegram?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I have not received any telegram from a person on earth on this subject; and if I should receive one it would find its way into the wastebasket if it was propaganda. I do not pay any attention whatever to propaganda telegrams. As soon as such a telegram comes I throw it into the wastebasket and do not pay any attention to it, unless it is a telegram like those which came to me from the people of the country during the time when we were so afraid the railroad bill, which saved this country from bankruptcy, was going to be vetoed, and the people of this land waked up and began sending telegrams here to Washington asking that the President sign that bill to save this country from bankruptcy.

I did pay attention to those telegrams, and produced some from about 50 citizens that I received from the State of Michigan one morning. I merely want to say in behalf of the teachers' bonus proposition that I hope arrangements will be made in time to let it go into this bill, and that it will not be stricken out on a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

Vocational rehabilitation: For an additional amount for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, as amended, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, funeral and other incidental expenses (including transportation of remains) of deceased trainees of the board, printing and binding to be done at the Government Printing Office, law books, books of reference, and periodicals, \$90,000,000, of which sum not exceeding \$5,000 may be expended for rent of quarters in the District of Columbia if space is not provided by the Public Buildings Commission: *Provided*, That the salary limitations placed upon the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation by the sundry civil appropriation act approved July 19, 1919, shall apply to the appropriation herein made.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FESS offers the following amendment: Page 35, line 7, strike out lines 7, 8, 9, and 10 and in lieu thereof insert as follows: "That no person be paid by said board out of the appropriation contained in this act at a rate of compensation exceeding \$2,500 per annum and rates above that sum, except not to exceed the following: One at \$7,500; 2 at \$6,000; 4 at \$5,000; 30 at not to exceed \$4,000; 40 at not to exceed \$3,500; 20 at not to exceed \$3,250; 80 at not to exceed \$3,000; 80 at not to exceed \$2,750; 100 at not to exceed \$2,500."

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this amendment does not strike out the proviso. It retains it, because I agree that we ought not to give blanket authority to any commission to pay any sort of salary they please. I think that would be a very serious blunder. Therefore the limitation is retained, but an effort is made in the amendment to increase slightly the salaries of something like probably 150 employees of this board.

As the membership of the committee know, the Committee on Education has been holding an investigation of the Federal Board for Vocational Education every day since the 2d of

March. That investigation is going on at this moment over in the House Office Building. We have covered the ground very exhaustively as far as we have gone. Some facts have been brought to light that would indicate that there have been some mistakes made that might be regarded as more or less grievous. However, I do not want at this time to make any sort of a report of this investigation, because later on the committee will likely make a regular report when we have closed the case.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman's amendment begins with salaries at \$7,500 and goes down to \$3,500. The gentleman knows of the testimony given by Mr. Holder, a member of this board, to the effect that prior to the time he went on this board for two years he had been drawing \$6 a day for week days and no pay for Sundays, with a travel allowance.

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And that when he went on the board his salary immediately went up to \$5,000.

Mr. FESS. My colleague on the committee will take notice that I have not referred to the salaries of the board. I am applying this amendment simply to the salaries of the rehabilitation staff.

Mr. BLANTON. The evidence shows that men who had never dreamed of such salaries in private life in the ordinary business world had their salaries raised up to \$3,500 and \$4,000 and in some instances to \$4,500 by the board after they were employed in this office.

Mr. FESS. I am not responsible for the appointment of any particular parties. I am sure my friend on the committee shares fully in what I am about to say, that the rehabilitation work will demand as keen an appreciation and ability as any work that we have in the country to-day; and I am constrained to believe that the work of the staff has been hopelessly crippled by the Government paying higher salaries in other work that certainly is not superior to it and that is through other departments robbing this particular division of its best men. I want the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to note this: The testimony given by the director yesterday showed us that they are losing to the War Department, which is doing not rehabilitation but vocational work, the best men they have, and nobody would say that the vocational work under the War Department is anything like as important as the rehabilitation work of the Federal Board. This Government ought at least to forbid the robbing of the best talent in the rehabilitation work by the War Department in its vocational work. We have found great loss in the staff for rehabilitation, not only by other departments of the Government taking them but also by private industry taking them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FESS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the gentleman's amendment provide that there shall be this number appointed at these salaries or not exceeding this number?

Mr. FESS. Not exceeding this number. There will be one at \$7,500. That will be the director. There will be two at \$6,000, who will be the district vocational superintendents, one at New York and one at Chicago. Then there are 12 other superintendents in these various districts.

Let me say to the committee that there has been surprising information that has come to our committee on the character of the work that is carried on now. We have compared this work with the work in Canada and the work in other parts of the world. Up to date, gentlemen, there are registrations in this work of 206,666 soldiers. Contact has been made with 174,197. Surveys have been made of 141,953. Approvals, section 2, which carries with it compensation allowances so that expenses are paid while they are in training, 58,099. Section 3, which does not carry compensation, but does carry tuition privileges of books, etc., 36,000. There are now in training 28,800 in section 2 and 1,834 in section 3. Approved, but not in training, 29,299 and 34,166. Gentlemen of the committee, the most advanced nation outside of our own in rehabilitation is Canada. Great Britain does a good deal, but it is mostly voluntary. France appropriates but very little for this work, and that is voluntary. Italy has not done anything like Canada. Canada is the furthest advanced of all, and here are the figures for Canada: Approvals, 37,693. Begun training, 33,845. The ap-

provals in our country, instead of 37,693 as in Canada, are 94,000. Begun training, 38,000, and the committee must keep in mind that we have been at the work two years shorter than Canada.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Certainly.

Mr. BEGG. Can the gentleman give the ratio of approvals to the number of those needing rehabilitation service?

Mr. FESS. I can not give the ratio, but it is much larger in our favor. That is largely due to the fact that our law is more liberal. There will be this question for the committee to consider, and that is whether we ought to eliminate entirely section 3 training, which does not carry compensation, but allows every soldier that has been crippled in a degree to be eligible to the training. If you do that, you are going to take in a great number that do not now embrace the opportunity. When I asked those in authority how much that would add, they said in four years it was contemplated to complete all the work and it would cost something like \$455,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FESS. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. The four years will not include very many, because there are only a few that enter college work, for example, in a four-year course. Quite a number, however, for three years, and a larger number for two years. We have made appropriations, and I think very generously, of \$90,000,000 in this bill. That is really all that has been asked.

I want now to reinforce what has been said here so many times from so many different sources, that in the case of taking the disabled man and putting him on his feet, to make him a self-supporting individual, to avoid anything like the attitude of charity, to be cared for by the Government, is one of the finest pieces of work that any Government has ever undertaken to perform.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. If we should pass the gentleman's amendment and raise these salaries, does not the gentleman know that it will simply induce officers who are now in charge to give larger salaries?

Mr. FESS. I have not the right to say that, but my judgment is that there will be some reorganization.

Mr. BLANTON. If we were sure of that, you would not find me making any point of order.

Mr. FESS. I have no right to say what the committee will recommend and I do not know what the House would do, but with all the work that is going on there have been some lapses and there is a lack of esprit de corps and breach of morale that ought to be by all means corrected.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. Is it not a fact that unless you do have larger salaries it will be absolutely impossible to procure these instructors?

Mr. FESS. Absolutely; and not only that, but you will lose what you have.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. To what extent are they losing these instructors?

Mr. FESS. To an alarming extent. I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that I mentioned a moment ago, that we are losing these men from the rehabilitation work to the vocational work in the War Department. I have the figures that will show that this division has been losing to the War Department doing vocational work because they are paying higher salaries. If there is a limit here, there ought to be a limit there, because it is not fair and it is crippling one of the most important pieces of work that we are doing, and I hope the chairman of the committee will let this amendment go on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have two minutes more. I would like to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If we should agree to the gentleman's amendment, what is there, then, to prevent the War Department continuing its deprivations by increasing the pay?

Mr. FESS. There is not anything.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Then what good will it do?

Mr. FESS. I think, gentlemen of the committee, that one of the greatest items of deterioration that this Government has ever suffered was when we voted a lump-sum appropriation to the War Department, and the War Department started out, even in the personnel organization here, to disorganize all the salaries. I have in mind one case of an assistant to a man who got a good salary, where the assistant got only two-thirds of the salary of his chief. He was taken in the War Department in this city to do some other work, somewhat similar to what he was doing, and immediately he was placed on a salary one-third higher than that of the chief that he had served under. I speak of a man who went out of the Congressional Library. That is true all along the line, and it seems to me we ought not to permit one division like this one to be continually interrupted by some other governmental division taking our best men because they pay a larger salary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is new legislation, unauthorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, there is no law which fixes a certain number of employees or attempts to fix their salary. This legislation seeks to do both. It seeks to fix one man at \$7,500, two at \$6,000, and some others at \$5,000, and so on, and it increases in a substantial amount the present appropriation.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this is subject to a point of order. The same item was carried in last year's bill, and it is a limitation instead of an addition.

The CHAIRMAN. The language in the bill to which the gentleman proposes his amendment is as follows:

That the salary limitations placed upon the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation by the sundry civil appropriation act approved July 19, 1919, shall apply to the appropriation herein made.

The effect of that language is to reinsert in this bill the language in the sundry civil appropriation bill to which it refers. The amendment of the gentleman from Ohio is in exactly the same language as the limitation carried in the sundry civil appropriation bill of last year, with the exception that the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio increases the salaries beyond the amounts carried by the limitation placed in the bill last year. The Chair thinks that if the language of the original limitation was in order as a limitation on the sundry civil bill last year, and if the language which is now carried in the bill is in order, as the Chair believes it is in order as a limitation, it is in order to amend the limitations in the way proposed by the gentleman from Ohio, as the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio does not change existing law, and the Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the desire of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] to improve the efficiency of the Federal Board for Vocational Education and to make their work more effective. I think perhaps the greatest work which Congress has authorized is the work of the rehabilitation of the soldiers injured in the recent war. It is a work that has the sympathy of all of us, and I am sure no one wants to do anything that will interfere in the slightest degree with the efficient operation of that board. What I am unable to understand is this: Originally the estimates were submitted to Congress in the regular way for \$38,750,000, and the board itself asked for the very limitation which is carried in the bill. Again, on April 9 of this year, the acting chairman of the board submitted an estimate for a supplementary appropriation, and in that estimate the acting director again asked for the same limitation with regard to salaries to be carried in the appropriation for the next year. It is true that a few days later the acting chairman of the board directed a letter to the chairman of the committee asking that that limitation be removed, but after asking \$90,000,000 for next year, the fact that the acting chairman of the board, after having worked under this limitation, and knowing what the limitation was, asked that the limitation be continued for the next year.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The director of the board, when he was originally appointed, received \$10,000. The director discontinued the work the early part of last year. His position has never been filled. The man who has his work gets \$6,000 a year, or \$4,000 less than the director originally received. I do not want to make statements that might be misconstrued, but we

can not hold that man very long, because we can not keep such men at that salary. It seems to me that the chief of the rehabilitation work ought to be paid a salary commensurate to the work that he is doing, and it is now \$4,000 less than the director originally received.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, under the present limitation we have 1 at \$6,000, 2 at \$5,000, 28 at \$3,500 to \$4,000, 70 at \$3,000, 60 at \$2,750, and 100 at \$2,500.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am not informed as to how the War Department got the right to pay superior salaries. Can the gentleman give me the information as to that?

Mr. GOOD. It was a lump-sum appropriation carried in the Army act, and that lump sum is carried in the current law and also in the bill that passed the House recently.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And as usual we always find these moneys appropriated by lump sum are expended in some way that Congress does not desire.

Mr. BLANTON. And yet we keep on appropriating in that way.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. With reference to these particular salaries of the Vocational Board, there are three of them that are better than the salaries now paid Congressmen, although nominally the salary of a Congressman might seem higher. Along the same line of reasoning we would not be able to get competent men to come to Congress. I refer now to the one who receives a salary of \$6,000 and the two who receive a salary of \$5,000. Because of the extra expense entailed by being a Congressman, those sums make those salaries much more desirable from a monetary standpoint than the salary of a Congressman.

Mr. FESS. The superintendent of the New York office has been changed four times, and each time the man went out on a better salary.

The present man who is there has been under fire for some time, especially during this investigation. The question is, if there is a vacancy how are you going to fill that at \$5,000 a year?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, I am not sure I shall not vote for this amendment; but I will ask my friend from Ohio, if I may have his attention for a moment, if he does not know a number of prominent educators in his own State who are not getting \$5,000 a year salary? I know of a good many in my own State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GOOD. I will ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOOD. Now, another thing to which my attention is directed is the rate of increase in administration expenses. For example, it is growing about as follows: In July the administrative expenses for salaries and wages were \$249,000; in August, \$327,000; in September, \$307,000; in October, \$228,000; in November, \$317,000; in December, \$459,000; in January, \$419,000; in February, \$351,000; in March, \$496,000, or an average of \$352,000 a month for salaries and wages when the total appropriation, including the amount paid to colleges and universities and schools for tuition, including the allowances under the law for subsistence, and so forth—the whole appropriation included thus far this year is \$30,000,000, with a deficiency pending of \$8,000,000. Now, I submit that the administrative expenses for this board, not for the men who train the men but the men who are examining the men for training and placing them, is out of all proportion to what it ought to be for the money expended. [Applause.] Now, I want to say in fairness to the gentleman from Ohio that the gentleman has been going into this matter, and he knows much more about it than I do, but there was no estimate made before the Committee on Appropriations for enlarging this limitation, and we assumed—and, I think, had the right to assume—that that limitation was satisfactory. We knew the work was increasing, and therefore felt that it might be unwise to cut down the limitation, and therefore left it where it is. Certainly the committee was entitled to some information if the limitation was to be removed. Notwithstanding that, I would not urge that as an argument against the amendment, for the work is too important to be judged by any such standard.

Mr. FESS. If the gentleman will permit me, one line of inquiry in this investigation brought out the fact that there were not the type of men doing the work who I think ought to be employed. I do not want at this stage to make any adverse criticism. I think the director or chief who is in charge of the work now is an unusually serviceable man, and I think every member of the committee has been wonderfully impressed with

his grasp of the work, and yet he tells us he has been crippled in the work right along the line we have been mentioning here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FESS. I ask that the gentleman have two minutes more.

Mr. GOOD. And I will yield that to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this, that the cost of the rehabilitation is most largely increased in the cost to the Government for rehabilitating the subjects and not the overhead. We took the figures yesterday of the overhead expenses. There have been some statements made that they have been somewhat startling, and we found that the overhead charge has been lessening constantly, until now it is less than 12 per cent, and if you can find any institution doing educational work where the overhead is less than that, you will do what I think can not be done.

Mr. GOOD. I know the gentleman from Ohio wants to be fair—

Mr. FESS. I do, absolutely.

Mr. GOOD. This does not include the overhead of the institutions where these boys are sent. That overhead goes on just the same, but it is an added overhead.

Mr. FESS. I mean the overhead in reference to those simply employed by the educational board.

Mr. GOOD. This is all overhead I am giving; this \$350,000 a month is all overhead.

Mr. FESS. The overhead would be but 12 per cent of the total outlay for the past three months.

Mr. GOOD. That is about correct.

Mr. FESS. And that is very low.

Mr. GOOD. I should say that it is much larger than any other Government institution that I know anything about except the Public Health Service.

Mr. FESS. Let me say to my friend that the thing that is distressing us is to make a contract with the soldier, and we are trying very hard to touch every individual who needs rehabilitation, and that, quite naturally, requires a lot of traveling.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this is a very great service, and, as some one stated a few moments ago, there is no service that is being rendered to the disabled soldier at this time which in any degree equals it, and I am sure that every Member of the House is anxious to have every reasonable appropriation made which is necessary to give to the disabled soldier the very best service. If in order to do this it is necessary to increase salaries of the various officials of the board, the House will not refuse; but I want to call the attention of the committee to this fact, that there was no estimate asking for a change or an increase of the salaries being paid to the employees of the board here in Washington. There was no request made by anyone who appeared before the committee on the hearings that those salaries be increased. There was no complaint made to the committee that they were unable to get proper and efficient service and competent supervisory officials to administer the law. Now, I am very much surprised at my distinguished friend from Ohio, whose sincerity and intense loyalty to principle everyone concedes. Time and time again he has stood upon the floor of this House and talked about the necessity of economy. Time and time again the gentleman from Ohio has spoken of the extravagance in the Government and of the necessity for curtailing our expenses to the lowest possible minimum consistent with efficiency, and I agree with him entirely. But here we have a proposition, meritorious, everyone knows that, but a proposition in which the parties themselves are not asking for an increase, so far as the hearings before this committee are concerned, a proposition on which no estimates have been submitted asking for an increase, and yet the gentleman from Ohio—

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee (continuing). Offers an amendment which will carry a considerable increase of salary to men who are now being employed in the Federal Board of Vocational Education.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman will agree with me that in our effort to economize we must not economize with respect to the crippled soldier?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Undoubtedly not. I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. FESS. That is one thing we all agree on. Secondly, if the gentleman were in the conduct of this work and was

under fire, with a newspaper publishing articles making attacks that are very bitter, and those attacks the subject of editorials throughout the country, would the gentleman come to Congress and ask for more money?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I would if I thought I was honestly entitled to it and deserved it. But I will state to the gentleman that these estimates were submitted last October, before this criticism to which the gentleman refers had arisen; and even at that time, so far as the estimates show, these salaries were considered satisfactory, and no request was made that they be raised. We are all willing to allow every dollar necessary for the comfort, welfare, and training of the crippled soldier. But, for my part, I am unwilling to make that a reason for increasing the salaries of those who are administering the law, unless it is clearly shown that they should have it. And in saying this I am not minimizing the value of the work being done by a number of highly worthy and efficient officials of the board. But we all must agree that this is a time for the practice of rigid economy.

Mr. FESS. Let me ask this question: The director of this work was on a salary of \$10,000. Why should we cut the chief of the rehabilitation service, who has the major work of this whole affair, to \$6,000? Now what is the justice of that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, I do not say that the former director was not worth \$10,000 or that the present one is not worth it. But I assume that a year ago, when Congress fixed the salary at \$6,000, and when the present official who is now occupying that position and drawing that salary accepted it, it was considered fairly sufficient for the amount of service rendered.

Mr. FESS. Then it was new work.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have no quarrel with the proposition to give the full amount that is necessary to obtain the most efficient service in this very meritorious and highly necessary work.

Mr. FESS. I know that is true.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But here the committee is confronted with propositions to increase salaries in a great many branches of the Federal service. There was no request from this board in the hearings, but there were requests submitted from other departments and other services. Now, the committee in a spirit of economy, believing this was no time, gentlemen, to increase salaries, believing this was a time when the utmost economy should be practiced, endeavored in this bill to reduce the expenses of this Government and hold them down just as low as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Just a minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Until the Committee on Education, of which the distinguished gentleman is chairman, can at least complete its investigation and make a report as to what salaries should be allowed, I hope this amendment will be rejected and that this House will not by way of an amendment offered from the floor undertake to increase these salaries and—

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for half a minute?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. FESS. The Committee on Education had a session and made this recommendation this morning.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then I submit it ought to come by way of legislation to the House and permit the House to discuss it as a matter of legislation and not by an amendment to an appropriation bill, as is sought here.

Mr. PARRISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] which would permit certain officers and employees of the Federal Board of Vocational Education to receive greater compensation than is now being paid them. I think it would result in more efficient service and will retain men in the work who are now already fitted by training and experience to best carry out the purposes of the law providing vocational training. If we are ever going to do anything for the men who have been wounded, crippled, and disabled in the service of our country in the way of giving them vocational training, it must be done with as little delay as possible. I happen to have had experience recently in appealing a number of cases to the vocational board here, and also have had occasion to learn something of some of the men who are now working on that board. For instance, over at Baltimore there is a man working as an officer on the Vocational Training Board who left a salary of \$3,300 per year as dean of one of the leading universities of this country and went into this service at

\$3,000 per year. By reason of insufficient appropriation for this work his salary is, after more than a year's service, reduced to \$2,500. My attention was called to this, and I was advised that he would resign from the service unless his compensation is immediately increased.

Knowing that he is a valuable man, I made inquiry at the head office here in Washington to ascertain why it was that men with the training and experience this man has were not receiving more salary than \$2,500 per year. I was informed that there are about 15 other men equal in experience and training with this man who will be forced out of the service or will retire in a short time unless some additional legislation or law granting a more liberal compensation is enacted. The man I have reference to is particularly fitted for this work; he is not only a graduate of the University of Texas, from which institution he holds the degrees of Master of Arts, Bachelor of Arts, and Bachelor of Laws, but has had wide experience as a training-school director and industrial training; he has attended northern and eastern universities and has credits that would almost, if not quite, enable him to secure his doctor's degree. He has made a special study of training schools and colleges of the United States and their entrance requirements with a view to being able to place enlisted men in any particular school or institution that would best fit them for their chosen work. Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize that the examination and placing of these men with efficiency and quickness in the field is vitally important at this time in order that the disabled men may be placed in training now rather than allow the work to drag along and their classification and placement be delayed until some future time, because if the men find they will be delayed, and there are many delays throughout the country now, they simply will not take advantage of the law. Already the service men are complaining of the delays. I have received letters from the different posts of the American Legion complaining because they are not able to get the wounded, crippled, and disabled men in a position to get the training they should have with sufficient promptness. I think this amendment should be adopted in order that we may do for these boys what we ought to do and do it now. A year from now may be too late; many of them will be in different vocations regardless of their wounds or injuries, and they will not drop the work they then have undertaken to take up other lines in order to get the training should it be offered them later, whereas they would take it now if their applications could be promptly considered and their training made immediately available.

My interest in this amendment does not go so much to the officers who are administering this law, though I think they are entitled to just treatment, as to the wounded and disabled boys. As was indicated by the chairman, the administration of this law and the placing of these boys is indeed a large undertaking, and, according to his figures, up to date there are registrations in this work of 206,666 soldiers. Contact has been made with 174,197. Surveys have been made of 141,953. Approvals, section 2, which carries with it compensation allowances, so that expenses are paid while they are in training, 58,099; section 3, which does not carry compensation but does carry tuition privileges of books, and so forth, 36,000. There are now in training 28,800 in section 2 and 1,834 in section 3. Approved but not in training, 29,299 and 34,166. From this it will be seen at a glance that there is much work yet to be done, and it goes without saying that if the men who have been in this work from the beginning, by reason of insufficient salaries or other causes, should retire and the vocational boards be deprived of their services, the work will be greatly disorganized, and consequently there would be many and serious delays, and who, except the wounded, crippled, and disabled soldiers, will suffer by reason of this delay? I am in favor of strictest economy at all times, but I am not in favor of practicing false economy when the burden of such short-sightedness will fall on the wounded and disabled soldiers of this country. For these reasons I strongly urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 22, noes 31.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks for tellers. As many as are in favor of taking this vote by tellers will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Twelve gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number. Tellers are refused. On this vote the ayes are 22 and the noes are 31, and the amendment is rejected.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on line 1, page 35, to strike out the word "trainers" and insert the word "trainees."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Good: Page 35, line 1, after the word "deceased," strike out the word "trainers" and insert in lieu thereof the word "trainees."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.

For five commissioners, at \$10,000 each; secretary, \$5,000; in all, \$55,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, in the course of the debate on yesterday there was some discussion of a provision pertaining to reclamation projects contained in a bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] providing for adjusted compensation for the soldiers of the late war. This provision is as follows:

Any unit not allotted to a veteran or repatriate within one year after the public notice in respect thereto, as provided by this section, may be disposed of to qualified citizens under the provisions of the reclamation laws.

At that time the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SMITH] stated that this provision was put in by the clerks of the drafting bureau. I have no doubt the gentleman from Idaho was so informed and believed his statement to be correct, but it happens that he is in error in this particular. I have examined into the matter and I find that the provision was contained in the original draft presented by the subcommittee which was appointed to consider this title and that this draft was presented to the drafting bureau as a basis for its work. Consequently the drafting bureau had nothing to do with its being in the bill, and I might say also, to the credit of the drafting bureau, that it never makes any changes in a bill which would alter in the slightest degree the policy of the measure unless especially directed by the committee in charge. I make this whole statement in justice to the drafting bureau, as some criticisms were expressed as a result of the remarks of the gentleman from Idaho.

And I might say further that, in my opinion, the provision is of no importance or value and might just as well be taken out of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Is not that water that has already gone over the stream?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman knows as much about that as I do. I make correction in behalf of the drafting bureau.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Dudley, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 13724. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Sabine River at or near Orange, Tex.; and

H. R. 13590. An act granting the consent of Congress to Sid Smith, of Bonham, Tex., for the construction of a bridge across the Red River between the counties of Fannin, Tex., and Bryan, Okla.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all other authorized expenditures of the Federal Trade Commission in performing the duties imposed by law or in pursuance of law, including personal and other services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, supplies, and equipment, law books, books of reference, periodicals, printing and binding, traveling expenses, per diem in lieu of subsistence not to exceed \$4, newspapers, foreign postage, and witness fees and mileage in accordance with section 9 of the Federal Trade Commission act, \$900,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. The chairman knows something of what we call the "bunch of reds" in the United States

having crawled into this department down there; the gentleman knows a little of that proposition, does he not?

Mr. GOOD. I have seen some newspaper comment on that subject, but personally I do not know anything about it.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the chairman how much of this \$900,000 is to be expended by the "red element" in this Federal Trade Commission?

Mr. GOOD. Of course, none of it ought to be used in the employment of persons tinged with that color, but the chairman has no knowledge with regard to the persons employed, except what he has seen in the newspapers, and that has been denied. I have no personal knowledge of it.

Mr. BLANTON. Would the chairman object to an amendment limiting this appropriation and providing that none of this appropriation shall be paid in salary or per diem to any person who preaches the overthrow of this Government by force and violence? I think maybe that will reach some of them.

Mr. GOOD. Well, that might involve some expense in the administration of this fund. If there are any such persons employed there, of course they ought to be discharged. No administrative officer ought to think for a minute of employing people who are not loyal citizens of the United States or people who advocate the doctrines referred to by the gentleman. I can see how it might involve administrative expense to ascertain the facts in regard to the question.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. KINKAID. I would like to have the chairman of the committee give us his opinion as to whether it would not be necessary to have it adjudicated that such a person was guilty of entertaining these convictions?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. You might have to constitute a court for that purpose.

Mr. KINKAID. I favor the idea, but—

Mr. GOOD. The idea is all right, but it might be difficult of execution.

Mr. BLANTON. We have just had a ruling to the effect that a member of the communist labor party in the United States who believes in that kind of doctrine is not deportable under the laws of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERDEPARTMENTAL SOCIAL HYGIENE BOARD.

The duties and powers conferred upon the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board by chapter 15 of the Army appropriation act approved July 9, 1918, with respect to the expenditure of the appropriations made therein are extended and made applicable to the appropriations for similar purposes made in this act.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I make the point of order on the ground that it is new legislation, and it is trying to reenact a former act of Congress carried on an appropriation bill that expires with the appropriation period covered by that bill. There is no existing law for it. If the Chair cares to hear something about it, I have got it here in front of me.

In the Army appropriation bill passed in 1918 an Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board was created, consisting of certain officers of the Government. It was created for four purposes: First, "to recommend rules and regulations for the expenditure of moneys allotted to the States under section 5 of this chapter." Section 5 merely makes an appropriation of \$100,000 for the carrying out of the purposes of the act for the prevention and cure of venereal diseases, and so forth. That is the first purpose for which it was created; therefore the duties of that board are limited to the expenditure of that \$100,000 carried in the appropriation act of 1918.

Second, it was created "to select the institutions and organizations and fix the allotments to each institution under said section 5," thereby limiting and demonstrating that this was a temporary war measure to cover the period of two years.

Third, it was created "to recommend to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy such general measures as will promote correlation and efficiency in carrying out the purposes of this chapter by their respective departments."

That relates to the protection of the cantonments of our soldiers from venereal diseases during the war.

Fourth, it was created "to direct the expenditure of the sum of \$100,000 referred to in the last paragraph of section 7 of this chapter."

And this \$100,000 was to be used under the direction of the Interdepartmental Hygiene Board for the purposes for which any of the appropriations made in this chapter are available.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, every duty of this board is limited to carrying out a definite appropriation made in the Army appropriation bill. Had it been intended that this should have been permanent law it would have said "the appropriations herein and hereafter made for these purposes," but no such intention exists in any portion of the act. No idea is expressed in any clause, paragraph, or portion of it except that it was for a war measure, and to protect our boys in the cantonments, and so forth, during the war. This paragraph to which I have reserved the point of order in this bill recognizes the fact that this is not permanent law, because it attempts to reenact it. Therefore the paragraph to which I objected in the present bill is subject to the point of order as new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GOOD. The Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board was created by chapter 15 of the Army appropriation act of July 9, 1918. That chapter was clear, pure legislation, and nothing else. It created a permanent department of the Government.

I was somewhat of the opinion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] when this matter was first presented. The committee went into the hearings. Men who drew the act came before us and gave us their interpretation of it. Then, after a close reading of the act, it appeared that it was the intention of Congress to create this board as a permanent board. Chapter 15 provides:

CHAPTER 15.

Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board: That there is hereby created a board to be known as the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board to consist of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury as ex officio members, and of the Surgeon General of the Army, the Surgeon General of the Navy, and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, or of representatives designated by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively. The duties of the board shall be: (1) To recommend rules and regulations for the expenditure of moneys allotted to the States under section 5 of this chapter; (2) to select the institutions and organizations and fix the allotments to each institution under said section 5; (3) to recommend to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy such general measures as will promote correlation and efficiency in carrying out the purposes of this chapter by their respective departments; and (4) to direct the expenditure of the sum of \$100,000 referred to in the last paragraph of section 7 of this chapter. The board shall meet at least quarterly, and shall elect annually one of its members as chairman, and shall adopt rules and regulations for the conduct of its business.

If it was not the intention of Congress to make this board a permanent board, then why did Congress say that annually the board should elect one of its members to act as chairman?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does not the gentleman know that that original act carried an appropriation for two years?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; I know it did.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Then to elect annually would cover that period.

Mr. GOOD. No; it does not say that at all. It says annually, and "annually" does not mean for a period of two years. It means annually.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It provided for one election during the meantime.

Mr. GOOD. I think that would be a very narrow construction, which the gentleman would not ask the House to make, on a law that provides what shall be done annually to say that it shall be done only for two years.

Now, it is true that that legislation was on an appropriation bill. The gentleman must recollect that many of the appropriations carried in the Army bill are specified for longer than a period of one year. Especially was that true during the war. Now, here was a cooperative work that was necessary during the war, but intended as a permanent thing. The appropriation was made to cover a period of more than one year, I assume, because of the allotment that would lapse at the end of one year, so that during the war there might not be any break in the work carried on by the board.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. BUCHANAN. In the paragraph to which I make the point of order you use this language:

The duties and powers conferred upon the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board by chapter 15 of the Army appropriation act approved July 9, 1918, with respect to the expenditure of the appropriations made therein are extended and made applicable to the appropriations for similar purposes made in this act.

Does the gentleman contend that that is not new legislation on this bill?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, that is new legislation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Then the gentleman concedes that that point of order is well taken.

Mr. GOOD. On which bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. On this bill, where you attempt to extend the law of 1918. The gentleman certainly does not contend that that is not legislation on this bill. Whether it is necessary or not is another question.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have not the floor.

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If this provision were not in the bill, would there be any authority for this board under chapter 15 of the Army appropriation act of July 9, 1918?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Would there be any authority?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes. I agree with the gentleman that this is purely legislation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This says that the authority heretofore granted shall be extended for the future.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes. That is exactly my contention, and that is purely legislation on this appropriation bill.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is all it is. It is not an appropriation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; it is legislation on this appropriation bill.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I fully agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GARNER. Put in there in order to make the appropriations available.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Is the gentleman's point of order to the language in lines 24 and 25 on page 35?

Mr. BUCHANAN. My point of order is to the entire paragraph and also covers that language. That is the object of that paragraph, to extend this war act of July 9, 1918, and to lay the ground for the appropriations in this bill. The chairman of the committee recognizes that this is new legislation and that there is no existing law to justify this legislation unless this paragraph is in the bill to make it available.

Mr. GOOD. I think as far as the language in this particular paragraph is concerned the point of order is well taken; but the point that I have been trying to make is that if the appropriation is justified under the act, then this language ought to be carried so far as the administrative provision is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. Chapter 15 of the Army appropriation act of July 9, 1918, contained a provision creating the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board. Some of the provisions of that act appear to be permanent law and some of its provisions appear to be intended to continue in force for a period of two years only. The effect of the provision to which the gentleman's point of order is made appears to be to extend not only the provisions which are permanent law and which do not need to be extended, but also to extend the provisions of the law which by its express terms expires at the end of two years into the next fiscal year. The Chair therefore thinks that the provision to which the gentleman makes a point of order is legislation, and sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses of the board, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, books of reference and periodicals, printing and binding, traveling, and other necessary expenses, \$80,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to that provision on the same ground as the other. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation of \$80,000 covers the expenses of the hygiene board and personnel in the District of Columbia. The sole purpose of that board is to direct the distribution under the original act of an appropriation made to be distributed to the boards of health of the several States.

If you examine the original act, it provides an appropriation for two years, and by its own terms it specifically states that it expires within the period of two years. Therefore, if the original amount to be distributed among the States in the act expires in two years, it has already expired, and this board ought also to go with it. As far as that is concerned, I can not see that any portion of the act is a permanent law.

I call the Chair's attention again to the very purpose for which that act was created. It was for the purpose of directing the distribution of a specific appropriation made in a specific section of that bill. When that distribution has been accomplished, then the whole act dies with it. I hope the Chair will read the purposes for which the act was created, because it specifies and limits the activity of the board on four proposi-

tions. These four propositions are carried in this bill; and if it was intended to be permanent it would have said something to that effect.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish, if I may, to reenforce the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas. It seems to me that the clear import of all the sections in this bill, except section 5, is to enable the administration of section 5. If the Chair will note, the purpose is, first, to recommend rules or regulations for the expenditure of moneys allotted to the States under section 5 of the act; second, to select the institutions and organizations and fix the allotments of each institution under said section 5; third, to recommend to the Secretary of the Treasury, to the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy such general measures as will promote correlation and efficiency in the carrying out of the purpose of this chapter by their respective departments; fourth, to direct the expenditure of the sum of \$100,000 referred to in the last paragraph of section 7 of this chapter. Every purpose that is defined in the act is with reference to the administration of section 5, and section 5 is merely the appropriation.

It seems very clear to me. Of course, we are familiar with the circumstances out of which it was adopted. It was for the purpose of protecting those who were called into the military service during the war. It was necessary to provide some method for the administration of the fund, and therefore this machinery was provided. It all centers, it goes to the very heart of it, on section 5. All appropriations expire at the end of two years.

Now, as for the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa that the word "annual" makes it permanent law, I can not agree to that. If I understood the gentleman correctly, his entire argument is swung around that word "annual" as a pivot.

Mr. GOOD. No; I think the first provision, where the board is created, contains language clearly of a tenor to indicate that it was a permanent board.

Mr. GARRETT. May I call the attention of the gentleman to this, and I read from the act: "The duties of the board shall be"—

Mr. GOOD. That is where they define the duties. Leaving out the question of duty, the question is whether or not there is a board here of this character. Certainly it appears to me from the reading of the language that it was the intention of Congress to create a board as a permanent board.

Mr. GARRETT. I do not agree in that opinion. I think the board was created simply to administer this fund, that there was no purpose of creating it as a permanent board, because of what use would the board be after it had administered the fund? It seems to me that there was a necessity of creating some agency to administer the fund, and this was the agency created. With the expenditure of the fund the function of the board ceased. As far as the word "annually" is concerned, of course that appropriation was to run for two years, and there could be, and I presume there were, if they obeyed the law, two elections of the chairman of the board.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be inclined to admit the force of the contention of the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Texas if it were not for the fact that the act itself negatives this contention. The act, among other things, authorizes the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board created by it "to recommend to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy such general measures as will promote correlation and efficiency in carrying out the purposes of this chapter by their respective departments." I emphasize the word "chapter" in this connection.

The chapter not only provides for the creation of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board but also for the creation in the Bureau of Public Health of a Division of Venereal Diseases, the duties of which are in part "to study and investigate the cause, treatment, and prevention of venereal diseases; to cooperate with State boards of health," and so forth. The life of this division is not limited to any given period, and duties which are apparently intended to be performed by it are duties which may be performed after the expiration of the appropriation carried in section 5.

Again, in section 5 the proviso reads as follows:

Provided, That the appropriations herein made shall not be deemed exclusive, but shall be in addition to other appropriations of more general character which are applicable to the same or similar purposes.

That proviso indicates that the board was expected to function not only with respect to the specific appropriations carried in the act but also with respect to appropriations which might be carried in other acts or which might perhaps be carried hereafter.

In the view of the Chair, it does not appear that the existence of the board has expired by virtue of the act itself. The Chair therefore thinks that the paragraph is in order, and overrules the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For assisting the States in protecting the military and naval forces of the United States against venereal diseases, \$150,000; and the unexpended balance on June 30, 1920 (approximately \$250,000), of the appropriation heretofore made for this purpose is continued and made available during the fiscal year 1921: *Provided*, That no part of these sums shall be expended in assisting reformatories, detention homes, hospitals, or other similar institutions in the maintenance of venereally infected persons.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that we have already passed items for the Public Health Service, one item of \$856,000, another of \$275,000, another of \$740,000, another of \$40,000, another of \$135,000, another of \$8,000, another of \$85,000, another of \$45,000, another of \$625,000, another of \$220,000, another of \$5,000, and one of \$500, aggregating \$3,034,500, and to that aggregate is added the sum of \$4,000,000. Does the chairman think that it is necessary to appropriate the extra \$150,000 and make available also \$250,000 additional?

Mr. GOOD. This is not administered by the Bureau of Public Health.

Mr. BLANTON. I know it is not.

Mr. GOOD. Of all the amounts the gentleman has indicated, there was an appropriation of \$200,000 available for venereal diseases. The \$150,000 which is appropriated here, together with the unexpended balance, is to be expended in those localities around Army and Navy camps, and is to protect the enlisted man.

Mr. BLANTON. The chairman recognizes that this was a wise provision during the war, when we had our boys in camps all over the country in every State in the Union, but such is not the case now. The camps are mostly abandoned now.

Mr. GOOD. There is a good deal of unrest in the United States. A good many of the boys have not gone back to work. There is a good deal of unrest around these Army and Navy camps. I do not think this ought to be a permanent thing, and I hope the time is soon coming when the whole appropriation can be eliminated.

Mr. BLANTON. How many men have we in camps of the United States to-day as compared with November 11, 1918?

Mr. GOOD. I am not advised; but, of course, we have a great many less.

Mr. BLANTON. We have comparatively very few, and surely the States themselves can take care of this proposition, aided and assisted by the Public Health Service, with the \$200,000 we have already given for this purpose. I do not think these sums ought to be appropriated, and I make the point of order against the paragraph. It contains new legislation on an appropriation bill and is unauthorized by law.

Mr. GOOD. It is not subject to the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. There is new legislation in the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to have the gentleman point out wherein it is not subject to the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. The provisions in this paragraph are not in accordance with the provisions in the original act.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, absolutely they are.

Mr. BLANTON. How about the proviso?

Mr. GOOD. That is a limitation, and that is intended to preserve and save the appropriation. I want to say this to the gentleman from Texas: He speaks about the number of men in the service of the United States as compared with the time the armistice was signed. The number of venereally afflicted persons at the time the armistice was signed was from 20 to 30 per thousand, and that number has gone up at the present time to from 90 to 100, a very alarming increase.

Mr. BLANTON. Then we have wasted the great sums of money that we have heretofore appropriated?

Mr. GOOD. The amount here is less than \$2 per man.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman state that since this board began operating the Government appropriations the number of persons afflicted with these diseases has begun to increase?

Mr. GOOD. I would not say from the time the board commenced to operate. I have forgotten now the percentage of venereally infected persons who were within the draft, but it was very large. According to the statement of Dr. Storey, it would seem that since the time of the signing of the armistice the number has very largely increased. The committee was somewhat influenced by those figures. The reports show that the condition is somewhat alarming.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Iowa the reason for the provision in this bill that prohibits the

use of any of these funds for reformatories or houses of detention?

Mr. GOOD. That is to prevent their use for that purpose.

Mr. BEE. In the city of San Antonio, which has a very large military establishment, it has been the custom in the past for the Public Health Service, through the Federal assistance, to render help to these institutions and detention camps near the great Army post there. We have a division there. The city has built a detention camp outside of the city limits, in which these people are kept.

Mr. GOOD. That would not fall within the provisions of this appropriation. It would come under the next provision, that has to do with the allotment to the States.

Mr. BEE. I just wanted to know whether the purpose was to withdraw from these detention camps, where these people are kept, any Federal assistance, especially when it is in the interest of the Army.

Mr. GOOD. No; the purpose of this limitation is that no part of the money shall be used for the maintenance and support of persons when they are detained, and the law does not embrace that, and the committee felt that no money should be expended; in fact, that it would be an enlargement.

Mr. BEE. The proximity of the large Army camp at San Antonio, I regret to say, is one of the things that makes necessary this large detention camp.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas insist upon the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. No; in view of the statement made by the chairman of the committee, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. THILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address the House briefly on two important issues. My reason for requesting time at this juncture is that 10 members of the Indian Affairs Committee, myself included, by direction and authority of this House, will leave on May 7 for a brief trip of investigation and inquiry into important problems concerning the Nation's wards, the Indians, and vitally affecting the interests of our Government as well in its dealings with disputed and vexatious questions bearing upon our relationship to the various Indian tribes, numbering in the aggregate 300,000 souls. I have been a member of the Indian Affairs Committee since my service began here more than five years ago. Every Member of the House knows that the annual Indian appropriation bill carries an average of \$11,000,000, and affects not only the Indians themselves, but hundreds of thousands of our citizens with no degree of Indian blood in their veins. If we defer this investigation until Congress begins its recess early next month, we shall not be able to visit and inspect the various Indian schools now in session, but which will then be dismissed for the summer. These schools are maintained, in part, at Government expense, and if we are to gather the information concerning these schools that this House expects us to obtain, and thus justifying the action of the House when it inserted the clause in the last Indian appropriation bill directing us to make this investigation, it is imperative that we go now.

SOLDIERS' RELIEF BILL.

Every one fully expected that the House would dispose of the soldiers' relief bill last Monday, the day agreed upon for its consideration, but the Republican caucus, which met on the evening of April 30 and which lasted far into the night, determined to postpone action on this important measure until some future time, and because of this postponement, which I personally deplore and regret, our investigating committee, composed of six Republicans and four Democrats, will be denied the privilege of being present to vote on this bill and to take part in the discussion concerning the same. My colleagues from Arkansas will secure for me a pair on this measure, and I record my vote for it. I also secured a pair with Mr. RHODES, of Missouri, a Republican and a member of the investigating committee, on all political matters that will come before the House during our enforced absence.

Reluctantly we entered the great World War. I supported every measure proposed that promised to conduct it vigorously and end it successfully. My only son, eligible for service, fought as a volunteer in France from the summer of 1917 until the last gun was fired on the 11th day of November, 1918, and came home bearing upon his body the scars of honorable wounds received while battling the Hun in the air high above the fields around Chateau-Thierry, St. Mihiel, and the Argonne Forest.

We can never repay our chivalric young men who breasted the red-tide battle on foreign shores or those who left their homes and good positions preparatory to settling our quarrels with the insolent foes of peaceful civilization, but who were denied the honor of measuring their armed strength with the

disciplined soldiery of the Central Powers. We have made and must continue to make generous provisions for our injured and disabled heroes and the dependents of our dead who sleep under the poppies of Flanders or the lilies of France.

During July and August, 1918, I had the good fortune to see the American soldier in action around and beyond the bloody trenches and shell-torn battle fields at Belleau Wood and Chateau-Thierry. I saw him in action fronting the trained veterans of the Crown Prince and driving them back at the point of his bayonet. I saw him grimly standing in line of battle, mud-bespattered or covered with the black dust of awful war. I saw him on the roadside shaking with shell shock and torn by German shells, brave, cheerful, smiling, patient, and fearless, bold as a fierce young eagle, admired and envied by all the allied soldiers, and I stood in pity and in sorrow and yet with a heart swelling with pride, hat in hand, beside the rude mound marked by a wooden cross where he slept in a new-made grave under the gray soil of France, the brave and beautiful land that he had defended with such signal gallantry. We must not hesitate to do justice to our living heroes or to make ample provision for the mothers or children or wives of those who died that civilization might not be destroyed by the ruthless militarism of Germany.

We can never fully compensate our young men who thus gamely battled under the allied flags in far-away Europe, and we should not haggle about a small recognition which will only partly express our admiration and love for the American soldiers.

I introduced a soldiers' relief bill two months ago. I earnestly hope the pending measure will pass, but I seriously object to the sales-tax feature, that seems to have the indorsement of the majority of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee. This unhappy provision proposes to touch with the Midas finger of Government authority every bootblack, every washerwoman, the poor widow, the hod carrier, the soldier himself—in fact, every citizen, and bleed gold from him to raise the bulk of the revenue necessary to pay the Nation's debt to its brave defenders. This money should be collected from bloated and swollen war profits, from contractors who fattened and grew lusty and purse-proud by gainful production under the careless eyes of those who were charged with the duty of rapidly procuring in the least time possible the vast equipment, supplies, food, and munitions necessary to send our troops to the front and to furnish them and help supply our allies with the swift means of winning the war. We should get this revenue—estimated to amount to a billion eight hundred million dollars—not from the weak, the poor, the small merchant, the farmer, the modest tradesman, the soldier, and the overburdened consumer—God pity him; he is suffering enough already and his back is bent with a burden of taxes and high cost of living ponderous enough to sink a Navy—but we should collect this fund from the heartless cost-plus Army contractors and from the corpulent pocketbooks of the suddenly rich millions of our stay-at-home profiteers, for whom our soldiers fought and our laboring people worked early and late that they might pile up limitless billions to waste in idleness and in luxury. They are the beneficiaries of the war which they so urgently advocated and desired, and they should now be compelled to disgorge a reasonable portion of their hastily acquired riches to compensate those who fought their battles for them. [Applause.]

THE WATER-POWER BILL.

I voted against the general water-power bill as it was finally reported by the conference committee of both Houses and passed by the House on May 4 last by a vote of 259 ayes and 30 nays. This bill has been pending many years. I am not a reactionary in any sense. I am in favor of progress and have always favored, and still favor, a proper and reasonable water-power bill, and have advocated such a bill, but the measure as finally agreed upon and passed by this House did not sufficiently safeguard the rights of the public. This bill as it finally passed violates well-established, well-settled, and wholesome principles of law, and both State and individual rights. The bill recklessly substitutes Federal interference and control over really non-navigable streams. It is proposed under this bill to erect a mighty dam in my district on a stream that is in no real sense a navigable stream at the place where the dam will be located. The farmers who own fertile sections of bottom land in Marion, Baxter, and Boone Counties in the third congressional district of Arkansas, which I have the honor to represent, those farmers who own places on White River and its tributaries above the proposed dam site, have written me numerous letters and have sent in petitions which I have filed in this House vigorously protesting against this measure, which means the destruction of farms on which they have lived for years and which they do not want to sell.

It is true that their property can not be taken or injured without compensation, but they insist that they have a right to be heard in protest and have the constitutional right to object to this legislation, and as their representative I have responded to their wishes and respected their petitions. The measure of damages to them for their loss and injury, as defined by the courts, will not, I am afraid, result in giving them just compensation for their losses. At best it is a harsh rule, under the provisions of this bill and under the general doctrine which obtains by reason of the law of eminent domain, to say to a home owner that this corporation or that, organized or financed by strangers in a far-away State, can take the home that his father carved out of the wilderness, the home where he played in childhood, the cemetery where his loved ones are buried, whether he chooses to sell or not. It is at best a rather one-sided privilege which allows to the stranger the right to institute a condemnation suit and drag a home owner to a far-away court and compel him to take his neighbors there as witnesses, force him to pay attorney's fees, and permit strangers to assess his damages and say what he should have for the home of his youth, which he prefers to keep and has no desire to sell. In response to the prayers and wishes of many of my farmer constituents, whose homes and farms will be destroyed by the dam proposed to be erected under the provisions of this bill, I joined with 29 other Members of this House and voted "no" on the passage of the bill mentioned, a record of the final vote on the same being shown on page 6539 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 4, 1920. [Applause.]

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, my district had commissioned me to represent them in Congress when war was forced upon our Government on April 6, 1917. We had made every effort possible to remain neutral. However, neutral ships flying their national flag were sunk in violation of international law by the Imperial German Government. Our own ships, flying our own flag and carrying our own citizens, were sent to an untimely, watery grave, and protests sent through diplomatic channels against the murder of our citizens upon the high seas accomplished nothing.

Our Government was notified January 31, 1917, that on the following day unrestricted submarine warfare would be resumed. Diplomatic relations were severed, but we did not go to war in the hope that no further hostile, overt act would be committed.

In the meantime German spies were infesting our country in an effort to poison the minds of the people. They sought to create a sentiment in favor of Germany and to prevent our entering the war. Millions of dollars were used in securing the insertion of paid articles in the metropolitan press. Thousands of acts of sabotage were committed, and hundreds of factories of all kinds were disabled. Bridges and other public structures were blown up to delay transportation. Official intrigues were entered into with our sister Republic on the south. The German Government did everything possible to embroil us in a war with Mexico, in the hope that we should not be able to render effective assistance in the World War.

When war was declared the patriotic sons of America left their homes and joined the colors. Counting the men who entered the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, approximately 4,800,000 responded to their country's call. No other country has such a spirit. It was the American spirit that so largely contributed to the winning of the war. It knows no obstacle and it knows no defeat.

I felt keenly the responsibility placed upon me temporarily by the people of my district. Under the circumstances I deemed it my duty to support all legislation that had for its purpose the winning of the war. We enacted:

First. A law increasing the pay of our soldiers, but everyone knew that the larger pay was not adequate compensation. They can only be fully compensated by the thought that they rendered the finest patriotic service and earned a Nation's gratitude.

Second. A law providing for the dependents left behind. It supplemented the allotment of the soldier who went to the front with an additional amount appropriated from the Federal Treasury.

Third. A law making generous provision for the soldier disabled in the service of our Nation. It is more liberal than the compensation law of any other country. The thousands who made such great sacrifices can not be too tenderly cared for.

Fourth. A law making adequate provision for vocational training and rehabilitation of the men who suffered injuries that make it impossible for them to follow the trades that were pursued by them before the war.

Fifth. A law providing that the soldier might be insured by his Government at a low rate. Insurance rates of private com-

panies were prohibitive for the average soldier who entered the service.

I voted for all of this legislation and for every appropriation recommended as necessary for munitions, food, clothing, and hospital supplies. I voted for every appropriation that would protect the soldier from disease and care for him when wounded.

Upon our entry into the war we soon appreciated that it was necessary to strengthen the defenses of Paris, and when our first troops were sent across the sea that it was essential to forward additional forces rapidly, if victory was to crown our efforts.

They won a glorious victory. We knew in advance that the spirit of America would triumph if we were only able to bridge the seas and transport our men in sufficient numbers to the battle front. Their deeds are known to all the world. At Chateau-Thierry, the St. Mihiel drive, and the bloody struggle in the Argonne Forest they won undying fame. Their gallantry will remain a cherished heritage to all the American people for centuries to come. Last year, on my trip to Europe, I went over these bloody battle fields and saw where our boys fought, struggled, and died. I stood with uncovered head by the graves of many of them. I said to myself that our Government, the greatest, the richest, and the strongest on earth, shall never be ungrateful to the men who rendered such signal service to their country, and particularly to the maimed and wounded, as well as to the dependents of those who made the supreme sacrifice and who now sleep under the poppies of France.

When the subject was being discussed as to the best means of showing our appreciation, I prepared and introduced a bill amending the Federal farm-loan act in February, 1919. I was a member of the Banking and Currency Committee when the Federal farm-loan act was passed, and have been intensely interested in the operation of this law. My amendment made an exception in favor of discharged service men. It extended him a long-time loan, if the soldier wished it, at a low rate of interest, with which to purchase a farm.

When Congress reconvened last summer I redrafted and re-introduced the bill, giving the following privileges: First, a preference right for two years to enter upon any of the public lands of the United States; and, second, the right to apply for a loan of 100 per cent of the value of the property purchased, either in the country or in a city or town. This bill, if enacted into law, would increase production and reduce the cost of living. More farm products would be thrown on the market, resulting in lower prices. It would give employment to the ex-service men. It would show a Nation's gratitude. It would have a tendency to curb unrest. This plan would not have cost the Government anything additional, unless it was for extra employees in the various farm-loan banks where the increased business would require them. I want to encourage every returned veteran to become a home owner.

Many other bills have been introduced and various propositions have been submitted for assisting ex-service men. It was urged that some would not want to buy homes, and would not, therefore, be benefited by the land-settlement provision. The bill now under consideration provides for land settlement; for the purchase of homes on long-time loans at low rates of interest; for vocational training of the soldiers in various trades and sciences; for paid-up insurance in a certain amount; and for adjusted compensation of \$1.25 per day for each day of service over 60 days between April 6, 1917, and January 1, 1920. The different options provided are quite generally satisfactory to Members of the House, and, in fact, there was not much criticism of them. It is hoped that the inducements presented in the bill to purchase homes, to take vocational training, and to secure paid-up insurance will so strongly appeal to the young men who have had military training and mental discipline that many of them will be led to take advantage of these provisions.

Assuming that all might select the adjusted-compensation option, it is estimated that it would require \$1,800,000,000. This would make it necessary to provide a means whereby additional revenue could be collected. It must be remembered that the funds in the Federal Treasury are replenished by taxes collected from our citizens. It was proposed that part of the money should be raised from a tax on tobacco, some from real estate transfers, a certain amount from stock-exchange transactions, and some from an increase in the income tax. In addition, a sales tax is proposed.

By means of a sales tax it is expected to collect from the people of the country approximately \$400,000,000. This tax is indefensible. Of course, it is paid by the consumers. It exempts no one. The washerwoman pays it, although living expenses were never higher. Every woman who purchases a

calico dress pays her part. It upsets the whole theory of taxation. It is an extremely annoying tax to collect. No tax is ever a welcome one. In our income-tax law we exempt unmarried men and women who earn less than \$1,000 per annum, and married men and women up to \$2,000 per annum, with a deduction of \$200 additional for each child. Not so with the sales tax, as it passes the tax on to the consumer, just the same as when a show ticket is bought and the war tax is added.

Of course, if this tax is now left in the bill under the guise of aiding the soldier, it will be made a permanent part of our taxation after such need ceases to exist. The soundest theory of taxation is to take into consideration the wealth and the ability of the taxpayer to pay. This sales tax places its hand upon every person and everything and makes no exemptions.

This question should not be a partisan issue. The boys who went to the front did so from every community and from every party. During the World War we laid aside partisanship and no bills were prepared by the majority members of a committee in executive session. The party in power is attempting to make a partisan question of this bill.

It was announced that the bill would be brought up on May 3, and that it was to be passed under a suspension of the rules after 40 minutes of debate, 20 minutes on either side. None of us saw the bill until May 1. It contains 45 pages, providing in very great detail the options I have explained and the method of raising the revenue necessary to carry them out. By bringing it up under a suspension of the rules no amendment could be offered to this important bill. I do not believe that any American citizen indorses this plan. I am sure no ex-soldier can indorse it.

This bill, as every other measure, should be referred to a committee, carefully considered, and reported back for consideration under the general rules of the House, where it could be debated and amendments offered. The Members of the House would then be permitted to vote upon each amendment proposed. The boys did not fight as partisans and we should not legislate in their interest as partisans.

It has also been proposed that the revenue be raised from an additional tax on excess war profits or profiteers or from the sale of long-time bonds, payable solely out of loans, principal and interest, made our allies, which would not further depress the value of our present outstanding bonds. I favor one of these methods in preference to the sales tax. If this bill had been considered on May 3, however, the majority party was maneuvering under a suspension of the rules to prevent a vote to eliminate this objectionable sales-tax provision and the substitution of any other provision.

I am glad to know that not a single post of the American Legion in my district nor a single soldier has written me favoring the sales-tax provision. Every one of them without exception denounces this method of collecting the revenue as unfair. They appreciate that it would have the effect of bringing the soldier himself into criticism. Every small merchant or other person doing business would be required to keep books and make reports at stated intervals. I want to make it plain to the people of the country that the fight over this proposed legislation ranged around the two following propositions:

First. Opposition to the method of considering the bill, whereby only 40 minutes of general discussion was to be permitted. This is a measure of vast magnitude involving \$1,800,000,000. The bill is 45 pages long, and no opportunity was to be given for amendment or adopting some other plan of raising the necessary revenue.

Second. The objection to the method of raising the revenue by a sales tax.

The country is proud of our soldiers. They rendered patriotic service of the finest order. They will always live in the hearts of our people. We can not sufficiently reward them. We can not too tenderly care for the disabled, nor can we too generously take care of the dependents left behind. We should approach these questions as patriotic representatives of a great Republic and not from a partisan standpoint. Let us be fair. Let us be just. Let us be generous. Let us be grateful. When civilization was imperiled, these men marched to the defense of humanity under the flag of our country. Let us so shape our legislation that it will be absolutely devoid of any partisan tinge. If we do not, we are unworthy of the brave, patriotic sons of America who left their homes and loved ones, willing to give all that the liberty of the world might be maintained. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For allotment to the various States for the prevention, treatment, and control of venereal diseases, \$450,000; and the unexpended balance on June 30, 1920 (approximately \$300,000), of the appropriation

heretofore made for this purpose is continued and made available during the fiscal year 1921: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be allotted to any State unless such State, in a manner satisfactory to the board, shall have complied with, and shall have given assurance of continued compliance with, the conditions and regulations governing such allotments and the expenditures that may be made therefrom.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this paragraph. If I understood the statement of the gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the committee, when he was explaining the previous paragraph to which the point of order was made, it does not include the continuation of this work beyond the two-year period, but only contemplates perhaps the possible extension of the work relating to military protection or protection of the military and naval personnel, and it seems to me that under that statement the act to which he referred—

Mr. GOOD. The military act provides for this very service, and during the past year, I will say to the gentleman, for example, the State of Massachusetts has been one of the largest recipients under this fund, receiving \$36,000 and asking for more, and Texas comes next.

Mr. WALSH. I think if that is so I shall make the point of order—

Mr. BEE. Why, because Texas comes next?

Mr. WALSH. That this particular provision is not authorized by law.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WALSH. It continues an appropriation of approximately \$300,000 in addition to a new appropriation of \$450,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to state to the gentleman I do not believe in all these cooperation appropriations, and since the Chairman of the committee has held that the hygiene board was in order then under section 4 of the original act this appropriation would be in order, because it says that it is the duty of that particular State to investigate the cause, treatment, and prevention of venereal diseases; to cooperate with State boards or departments of health for the prevention and control of such diseases within the State; and that makes clear the duty of that particular cooperation; and while I would like for the whole thing to go out—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Does the gentleman contend that the creation of a board to cooperate with a State is an authorization to pay money to the State?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Well, it seems to have been so held, but I was of the other opinion, and I think the whole appropriation is out of order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. We create a board of the Federal Government to cooperate with the State, and does that mean that we authorize that an appropriation be given to the State? Giving money to the State is not cooperation with them; that is just giving.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am inclined to think that the gentleman is entirely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not see where there is any authority in this law for any appropriation to be paid to the State beyond the original appropriation, and it certainly can not be done without authority of law.

The CHAIRMAN. The provision in chapter 15 which has heretofore been referred to and which alone could sustain this appropriation, if it can be sustained at all, is as follows:

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are hereby authorized and directed to adopt measures for the purpose of assisting the various States in caring for civilian persons whose detention, isolation, quarantine, or commitment to institutions may be found necessary for the protection of the military and naval forces of the United States against venereal diseases.

The Chair thinks that very clearly does not authorize the allotment of funds to States to be spent by them in their discretion for the prevention of venereal diseases. The other provision the Chair has in mind is section 4 of that chapter, which provides:

SEC. 4. That the duties of the Division of Venereal Diseases shall be in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, (1) to study and investigate the cause, treatment, and prevention of venereal diseases; (2) to cooperate with State boards or departments of health for the prevention and control of such diseases within the State—

And so forth.

Now, if this appropriation can be sustained at all it must be under that provision. The Chair does not think that an authority given to a Government board to cooperate with a State board or department of health is an authorization for

an appropriation to be allotted to a State board to be expended by the State board in its discretion. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing pending, the Chair will state to the gentleman. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment to universities, colleges, and other suitable institutions, for scientific research for the purpose of discovering more effective medical measures in the prevention and treatment of venereal diseases, \$85,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that paragraph; and, for the sake of getting along faster, to include the second, which involves the same principle. Both are subject to the construction the Chair has just announced.

In addition to that there is no mention in the original act of creating a hygiene board. It does not even come within the duties of that board to cooperate with these colleges and universities throughout the country. It is nowhere prescribed in that act. It is clearly out of order in this bill as new legislation and there is no law on the statute books authorizing it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment to universities, colleges, and other suitable institutions and organizations for the purpose of discovering and developing more effective educational measures in the prevention of venereal diseases, \$250,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order on that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks there is no authorization of law for the paragraph, and therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of the respective sums contained in the two preceding paragraphs shall be paid to any university, college, institution, or organization which does not set aside an additional sum for the same purpose at least equal to twice the amount to be received from the United States.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike that out.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the paragraph just read will be disagreed to. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board, \$1,015,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the total is radically wrong now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Texas that the Clerk has been authorized to correct the totals.

The Clerk read as follows:

Valuation of property of carriers: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry out the objects of the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof," by providing for a valuation of the several classes of property of carriers subject thereto and securing information concerning their stocks, bonds, and other securities, approved March 1, 1913, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and including not exceeding \$20,000 for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia, \$1,750,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia if suitable space is provided by the Public Buildings Commission."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the gentleman state that the progress made by this commission in carrying out this work is such as to lead us to hope that it will soon be completed?

Mr. GOOD. The field work is practically completed. It was the opinion of Judge Prouty that the entire work of valuation will be completed some time during the next year. On quite a number of the roads the surveys have been made, and they have all their figures. It has been because of certain conditions imposed by the transportation act making a little difference of computation in what they had been making before. But that is largely the work here in the office and will not involve additional field work.

Mr. WALSH. Now, does the gentleman mean that the field work, which was done several years ago, when values were lower than they are to-day, has been brought up and readjusted so that it is upon the same basis as the work done in the last few months?

Mr. GOOD. My recollection is that all calculations are based on the valuation of January 1, 1916.

Mr. WALSH. How much of a task will it be to bring that up to date after all the statistics have been gathered?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know to just what extent the commission will bring that work to date—that is, to readjust to the changing conditions because of high prices. My recollection is that it was that statement of Judge Prouty that the valuation of property would be on the basis of valuation as of January 1, 1916. Now, of course, a great deal of the equipment and the additions and betterments that have been obtained since that time are costing considerably more money, but I take it that because of the fact that most of that work was done by the Government those figures would be available.

Mr. WALSH. Can the gentleman state what will have been expended for this work when this \$1,750,000 is expended?

Mr. GOOD. Something like \$21,000,000.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the motion to strike out.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Why is it necessary to spend so much money for rent of buildings? I find scattered through this—even if it is not in this bill, it is in others—there are \$140,000 on two pages, when we have got acres and acres of space down here that is not occupied.

Mr. GOOD. We provide that it shall not be used if available space can be obtained from the commission.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Well, you know it will not be.

Mr. GOOD. That is a congressional commission, composed of Members of the House and of the Senate. You will have to take it up with the members of that commission. They are Members of the House and Senate.

Mr. GARNER. Who are they?

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], and Senators SMOOT and SWANSON are members of that commission. It is their duty under the act of Congress to allocate this space as long as it is available. Now, they find during the present year that there was no vacant space, and had to rent.

Mr. GARNER. How does the gentleman account for the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MacGREGOR] that there are "acres and acres of vacant space" and the statement of the commission that there is no space available?

Mr. GOOD. In some of these places there are long-term leases, and I hope the Government will continue to pay its obligations. When it enters into a lease at all, I hope it will pay its obligations, whether it has use for the space or not.

Mr. MacGREGOR. But the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations ought to take judicial notice of the fact, ought he not, that there are buildings down here that are practically unoccupied, with a great amount of space that is occupied by individuals spread out who could be jammed together somewhat? Now, after we have got some of these clerks out of there there ought to be some economy along that line.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all authorized expenditures under the provisions of the act of February 17, 1911, "to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," and amendment of March 4, 1915, extending "the same powers and duties with respect to all parts and appurtenances of the locomotive and tender," including such stenographic and clerical help to the chief inspector and his two assistants as the Interstate Commerce Commission may deem necessary, and for per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, \$290,000.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. McKEOWN. I wanted to ask the chairman of the committee how much additional money is necessary for this commission to carry out the duty of determining the amount of the claims of the various railroads under the transportation act, and also for investigating the question of the increase of rates under the transportation act? How much additional is required for that purpose? Can the gentleman answer?

Mr. GOOD. My recollection is that the estimate was around \$600,000 for the work connected with the general expenses of the commission and \$300,000 on the carriers' account.

Mr. McKEOWN. That much increase is made necessary in order to determine the claims of these railroads against the United States accruing during the time they were under Federal control?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. And also for determining the question of increased transportation rates?

Mr. GOOD. That would include the guaranty for the six months' period under the transportation act, and other provisions carried in the transportation act. It was not all with regard to that other matter.

Mr. McKEOWN. That is approximately the amount?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the chairman what provision, if any, has been made for the settlement or disposition of claims against the telephone and telegraph lines while they were under Government supervision?

Mr. GOOD. None. I think the Postmaster General has caused an estimate for a deficiency to be transmitted to Congress calling for \$14,500,000 as a deficit growing out of the Federal control and operation of the telegraph, telephone, and cable lines.

Mr. BLANTON. Some of the attorneys in my district are writing me, and some have even wired me, as to how they should proceed. They are up in the air. They do not know whether to file a claim or to bring a suit against the telephone and telegraph lines themselves or against the Government agent for the recovery of claims incurred during the time the Government had the wires under its control.

Mr. GOOD. Of course, the Postmaster General was the official in charge, and I would suggest to the gentleman that he get the information from that source as to the method of procedure. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For scientific research, technical investigations, and special reports in the field of aeronautics, including the necessary laboratory and technical assistants; traveling expenses of members and employees; office supplies, printing, and other miscellaneous expenses, including technical periodicals and books of reference; equipment, maintenance, and operation of research laboratory and wind tunnel, and construction of additional buildings necessary in connection therewith; maintenance and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle; and purchase, maintenance, and operation of one passenger-carrying motor cycle; personal services in the field and in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for clerical, drafting, watchmen, and messenger service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, shall not exceed \$50,000; in all, \$200,000.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I find myself torn by conflicting emotions in regard to this paragraph. As a friend of aeronautics and desiring to see the Government continue the development along this line in every direction possible, I should favor reasonable appropriations for the purposes set out in this paragraph. On the other hand, I regret to see appropriations that were large during the war increased in amount in the years succeeding the war.

I find that the amount carried in this item in the sundry civil bill a year ago has been increased by \$25,000, and that the amount that can be expended for clerical, drafting, watchmen, and messenger service for the year has been increased by \$7,000. I should like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill for an explanation of this.

Mr. GOOD. This is an organization that has been making a scientific study of aeronautics. My own opinion is that for every dollar appropriated for this purpose a good many dollars might be taken off from the Army bill for aeronautics. They have simply wasted money by the hundreds of millions for aeronautics in the Army, and the principal reason was that they knew nothing about it and showed a very great disinclination to learn anything about it so far as the science of it was concerned. There are third and fourth rate powers that have done more work with regard to aeronautics from a scientific standpoint than the Government of the United States has done.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is going to make a political speech we might as well have a quorum here to listen to it.

Mr. GOOD. I am not going to make a political speech. I am simply stating the actual facts with regard to this case.

One of the best things that was done was to provide for this National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. There are on this committee a representative of the Army; a representative of the Navy; Dr. Stratton, of the Bureau of Standards; and Dr. Walcott, of the Smithsonian Institution. Men are detailed from the Army and the Navy to cooperate in this scientific investigation. They asked for \$437,000 for scientific investigation, and the men on this board feel that the place for the Government of the United States to spend its money now and in the immediate future with regard to aeronautics is, first, in finding out the principles governing aeronautics, and that is what they are trying to do. I think they are doing splendid work, and the increase of \$25,000 here, it seems to me, is a very slight increase

when they were asking for an increase of \$262,000. The things they desired were things that they felt were absolutely essential.

Now, I submit to the gentleman that the question is a scientific one. I know very little about aeronautics. I was satisfied that they did need, for instance, a motor cycle to trail the aeroplane when it was being tried.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. The time does not belong to me.

Mr. TILSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACGREGOR. If a motor cycle is needed, why do they not get it from the War Department, which has a large number of them at Camp Holabird?

Mr. GOOD. That is what the law requires them to do.

Mr. MACGREGOR. It does not say so.

Mr. GOOD. That is the law already.

Mr. TILSON. I did not intend to go into the details of the item, but into the principle involved. I am glad to hear the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] say that this committee for the development of aeronautics is doing a good work, because I think that its members have the right idea, and that they are proceeding along the right line if they insist that those who produce aeroplanes shall know what they are doing before they expend great sums of money in the production of planes and engines not designed or constructed upon sound principles. One of the troubles during the war was that we proceeded to expend vast sums of money along untried lines before determining the scientific basis upon which to expend the money. As a result, much of it was lost. In both the Army bill and the Navy bill there is a considerable sum carried for the purpose of experimentation in aviation. Of course we wish that to go on, but we do wish to have it go on scientifically and not have the money wasted. If this is the bureau in which to do this work—and I am inclined to think it is—then the experimentation should be done under the appropriation carried in this bill along scientific lines. Without doubt much of the money we have spent for the development of aeronautics in both the Army and the Navy has been practically wasted. The right kind of work done under this appropriation ought to do much toward preventing such waste in the future.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment to ask the gentleman if these commissioners are not men who already hold official positions under the Government?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. If we are paying them adequate salaries for the work they are supposed to do as the heads of departments, how can they have the time to make scientific investigations along these very important lines?

Mr. GOOD. There are more commissioners than I at first had in mind. There is Mr. Walcott, chairman; Mr. Stratton, secretary; Joseph S. Ames, Thurman H. Bane, Capt. T. T. Craven, William F. Durand, J. F. Hayford, Charles F. Marvin, Maj. Gen. Menoher, Michael I. Pupin, Rear Admiral D. W. Taylor, and Orville Wright. They are members of the commission, and none of these men who are commissioned officers or other officials of the Government who receive salaries draw any salary out of this appropriation.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that, of course.

Mr. GOOD. It is an advisory commission of scientific men, and under them are detailed officers from the Army and the Navy who have the ability to carry on scientific research.

Mr. WALSH. I do not wish to reflect on the learned gentlemen comprising this commission, but I venture the assertion that if it were confined to the last three names—to Gen. Menoher, Admiral Taylor, and Orville Wright—we would get just as valuable information and just as practical information and a little less science, and it would be of more benefit to the service and the Government which is going to use this system of aviation and aeronautics in the future. How much has this appropriation been increased?

Mr. GOOD. The amount carried in 1919 was \$200,000, this year \$175,000, and we carry in this bill \$200,000.

Mr. WALSH. What is the necessity for the increase?

Mr. GOOD. There are quite a number of things that they asked the committee for.

Mr. WALSH. They do not include in their duties any investigation as to what became of the \$680,000,000 that was appropriated, do they?

Mr. GOOD. No; I think not.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, at one time I was somewhat informed in regard to the activities of the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics. I never was fully persuaded that the work done was all of it of prime importance, but I have no

doubt but what the scientific gentlemen composing that committee will do some good work. I am very much in hopes that we will get value received out of that appropriation.

But in this connection, while we are discussing the advisability and necessity and warrant for an increase by \$25,000 of the appropriation for this particular class of work, I want to call attention to the fact that the naval bill recently passed the Senate with an increase of \$12,000,000 for aeronautics. It passed this House with an appropriation of \$15,000,000, the same amount carried in the Army bill, but the Navy, of course, could not be expected to be satisfied with the measly sum as they state the Army received for this sort of enterprise, and so they raised the ante by the sum of \$10,000,000—a small and inconsequential sum in the opinion of gentlemen who are interested in this class of work and who believe that a large part of the national income should be spent for that purpose.

I am willing to accept the judgment of this committee as to the advisability of adding \$25,000 to this appropriation, but I do hope that when the naval bill reaches us we will, all of us and without exception, take a position in opposition to the increase of \$10,000,000 for aeronautics carried in the naval bill.

Take all of our appropriations for this purpose—the Army, the Navy, the sundry civil bills—without any increase above those carried in the bill as they passed the House, and we will spend directly and indirectly for aeronautics in the neighborhood of \$50,000,000. That ought to be enough for the advancement of this science for one year in times when we are trying to save the people's money. I hope this increase in the naval bill along with sundry and divers other increases will not be agreed to by the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the commission created by section 22 of the public buildings act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stats. L., p. 885), to continue proceedings toward the acquisition of lands required for a connecting parkway between Potomac Park, the Zoological Park, and Rock Creek Park, \$200,000, to be available until expended and to be payable one-half out of the Treasury of the United States and one-half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the total area of lands finally to be acquired for said parkway shall not exceed the area and parcels described and delineated in the map No. 2, contained in House Document No. 1114 of the Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, except that the following parcels outside the said taking line shall be included, namely, 315 feet of lot 801, 398½ feet of lot 54, 5,035 feet of lots 39, 40, 41, 42, and 43, lots 826, 827, and 828, containing 4,915 feet, and lots 36, 37, and 38, containing 6,983 feet in square 2544; and lots 819, 820, 19, and 20, containing 10,626 feet, part of lots 21, 814, 815, 816, 817, and 45, containing 10,290 feet, and lots 46, 822, and 821, containing 9,146 feet, in square 2543, in all, 47,708.50 feet: *Provided further*, That the expenditure of the funds appropriated herein shall be subject to all the conditions imposed by the sundry civil appropriation act approved July 1, 1916.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Why is it necessary, with the condition of the Treasury as it is, to enlarge the parks of Washington and go into this increase of acreage to make more expense for the Government to keep up?

Mr. GOOD. This is a work that was started a number of years ago, as the gentleman knows. They have purchased now about 41 acres of ground at less than the assessed value of the land. Does the gentleman have reference to the new authorization?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes; why is it necessary to go ahead with this? Why not let that work rest for a while?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to explain that I think by a map. The matter was presented to the committee by Col. Ridley. This map will show the situation. When the original survey was made, mistakes were made with regard to the contour of the land. It is proposed to buy this tract that is marked "A" and the tract marked "B," so as to permit the location of the road as indicated by this pink colored strip here. If this land is not purchased, then the road must be located farther down into Rock Creek Park, and to do that the contour of the land is such at both of those places that it will be necessary to make extensive fills and also to build extensive retaining walls. The expenditure estimated for the land is much smaller than the cost of the retaining wall and fill.

The land so far has been purchased at considerably less than the assessed value. The assessed value of the land in this area marked "A" is \$17,744 and in the area marked "B" is \$6,763. It was estimated that to build the retaining wall and make the fill that would be necessary to locate that road, if this land was not secured, would cost in the neighborhood of \$60,000 or more. The matter was presented to the committee with other matters with regard to purchase, but it seemed to the committee that this was a business proposition that ought to commend itself to the business judgment of every Member of the House. Inasmuch as that road is to be located, authority ought to be given to purchase the land before any work is done toward building a retaining wall or making the fill.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does not the gentleman think that \$200,000 appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section might well have been saved, even granting that the purchase of the land would be good business? Does not the gentleman think that this appropriation ought to be deferred?

Mr. GOOD. The committee considered that matter. We cut the estimate from \$400,000 to \$200,000. The appropriation last year was \$250,000. Col. Ridley said it was absolutely necessary in order to pick up the land before houses were constructed upon it, when they could buy it for much less than the assessed value, and that they ought to have a fund available. It would have been far more economical if years ago, when this land could have been purchased for a few cents a foot, we had purchased it. The committee was not unmindful of the demands on the Treasury, and it was only to prevent speculation in the land and to pick it up when opportunity was afforded to pick it up at a fair price that we have recommended this appropriation. To purchase all of the land that it is intended to purchase under the act of Congress authorizing the purchase would require several hundred thousand dollars in excess of what we have appropriated. We have appropriated only what the committee felt was the minimum in order to permit the commission to go along in a businesslike way, only purchasing those tracts where the land was offered at a very reasonable price.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. There have been some recent improvements in the vicinity of these areas that are proposed to be purchased. Have none of them been on either of the areas proposed to be purchased?

Mr. GOOD. No; not on either of those tracts.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY SHIPPING FUND.

The authorization of \$2,764,000,000, heretofore established for the construction of ships, is reduced to \$2,664,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. Good: Page 43, lines 11 and 12, strike out "\$2,664,000,000" and insert "\$2,614,000,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, that is simply to reduce the authorization of that amount and still leave a margin of safety over present contracts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANDERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13870, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

BRIDGE ACROSS ARKANSAS RIVER, OKLA.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of two bridge bills, H. R. 13665 and 13666. Mr. Speaker, I would not do this except I am going to be absent, called away on the Indian Committee to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13665) granting the consent of Congress to Muskogee County, Okla., to construct a bridge across the Arkansas River, between sections 16 and 21, township 15 north, range 19 east, in the State of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the bill be reported; I do not object.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to Muskogee County, Okla., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Arkansas River, at a point between sections 16 and 21, township 15 north, range 19 east, near the town of Fort Gibson, in the county of Muskogee, in the State of Oklahoma, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "point," insert the following: "suitable to the interests of navigation."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of another bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13666) granting the consent of Congress to Muskogee County, Okla., to construct a bridge across the Arkansas River, in section 18, township 12 north, range 21 east, in the State of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the bill be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill.

The bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to Muskogee County, Okla., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Arkansas River, at a point, in section 18, township 12 north, range 21 east, near the town of Webbers Falls, in the county of Muskogee, in the State of Oklahoma, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "point," insert "suitable to the interests of navigation."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HASTINGS, a motion to reconsider the votes by which the two bills were passed was laid on the table.

CROW INDIANS.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House agree to the Senate's request for a conference on the bill S. 2890, and that conferees be selected.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to insist upon the House amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate on the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2890. An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair appoints the following conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SNYDER, Mr. ELSTON, Mr. RHODES, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HAYDEN.

The SPEAKER. In reference to conferees on the bill H. R. 400, the Chair asks unanimous consent to appoint Mr. SINCLAIR and Mr. GANDY as conferees in place of Mr. ELSTON and Mr. CARTER, resigned. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revised and extend my remarks on the sundry civil bill to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PARRISH. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that May 5 they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H. R. 13677. An act making appropriations to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for the Federal control of transportation systems and to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 2528. An act to grant certain lands to the city of Pocatello, State of Idaho, for conserving and protecting the source of its water supply; and

S. 3016. An act to authorize the disposition of certain grazing lands in the State of Utah, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, May 7, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for expenses of collecting the war revenue during the remainder of the fiscal year 1920, together with a proposed paragraph of legislation authorizing the use of certain unexpended balances (H. Doc. No. 754), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 411) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to certify certain findings of fact, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 933), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 578) providing for the survey of public lands remaining unsurveyed in the State of Florida, with a view of satisfying the grant in aid of schools made to said State under the act of March 3, 1845, and other acts amendatory thereof, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 934), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12469) to authorize the award of a medal of honor to Chief Gunner Robert Edward Cox, United States Navy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 929), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HERNANDEZ, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 3218) for the relief of Martina Sena, Luis E. Armijo, and Maria Baca de Romero, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 930), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRITTEN, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13911) for the relief of J. Henry Miller (Inc.), reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 931), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FOCHT, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9843) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Myron C. Bond, Guy M. Claffin, and Edwin A. Wells, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 932), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2861) for the relief of the Davis Construction Co., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 935), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BABKA, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8142) for the relief of Anna Blumenthal, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 936), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 13958) to increase the revenue by imposing a tax on certain sales of newsprint paper, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 13959) to add certain lands to the Santiam National Forest; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 13960) to amend an act approved February 27, 1919, entitled "An act granting the consent of the Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near McKees Rocks Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13961) to amend an act approved February 27, 1919, entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Millvale Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13962) to amend an act approved February 27, 1919, entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near the borough of Wilson, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13963) to amend an act approved February 27, 1919, entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River, at or near Sixteenth Street, in the city of Pittsburgh, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 13964) to amend the war-risk insurance act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. IRELAND: A resolution (H. Res. 547) to provide for the compensation of a substitute telephone operator; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LITTLE: A resolution (H. Res. 548) to authorize the Committee on Revision of the Laws to employ additional assistants; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A resolution (H. Res. 549) requesting the Attorney General to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLATT: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 351) extending the provisions of an act amending section 32 of the Federal farm loan act approved July 17, 1916, to June 30, 1921; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAMILL: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 352) to receive Dr. Patrick McCartan as Ireland's diplomatic representative; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 13965) granting an increase of pension to Mattie Hawk; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 13966) granting a pension to Minnie Baker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 13967) granting a pension to George W. Richards; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 13968) authorizing the allowance of additional homestead application of Edward E. Voedisch; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 13969) granting an increase of pension to Henry Oehloff; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 13970) granting a pension to Eliza E. Clink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOONEY: A bill (H. R. 13971) for the relief of Edwin Formhals; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 13972) for the relief of the Gauley Mountain Coal Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 13973) granting an increase of pension to Andrew C. Shearer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 13974) granting a pension to Emma Phipps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 13975) for the relief of Lewis W. Flaunlacher; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3462. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of United Engineering Societies of the Canal Zone favoring the Jones-Reavis bill; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

3463. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of mass meeting of workers of Milwaukee, Wis., demanding civil and human rights and release of political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3464. Also, petition of Local No. 416, Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers' International Alliance, of La Crosse, Wis., favoring amnesty for political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3465. Also, petition of American Newspaper Publishers' Association advocating certain legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3466. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of W. J. McKeown and F. B. Densmore, of Springfield, Mass., favoring the passage of the civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

3467. Also, petition of 44 residents of Massachusetts favoring the bonus for ex-soldiers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3468. Also, petition of Curtiss Airplane Co. of New England, Boston, Mass., favoring the passage of House bill 10918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3469. Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Lawrence, Mass., regarding tax legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3470. Also, petition of County Sligo Benevolent Association of Greater Boston, favoring the freedom of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3471. Also, petition of American Legion, Department of Massachusetts, favoring the passage of House bill 13407; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3472. Also, petition of Rev. B. D. Budlong, of Boston, Mass., favoring the passage of House bill 13334; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3473. By Mr. HERSMAN: Petition of members of Fremont Post, No. 52, American Legion, Palo Alto, Calif., praying for the passage of the so-called Wason war-risk insurance bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3474. Also, petition of Presbytery of San Jose, Calif., favoring the passage of legislation organizing the chaplains of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3475. By Mr. KAHN: Petition of County Supervisors Association of the State of California, favoring Federal contribution to the maintenance, support, and proper equipment of tubercular sanitariums for tubercular patients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3476. Also, petition of American officers of the Great War, favoring legislation providing compensation for ex-service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3477. Also, petition of American officers of the Great War, favoring compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3478. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Heineman Bros., of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the proposed increased tax on cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3479. Also, petition of Columbia Graphophone Manufacturing Co., J. I. Middleton, Hutzler Bros. Co., Bernheimer Bros., Braeger Department Store, C. H. Reeves, jr., Hochschild, Kohn & Co., and Thomas H. Gaither, jr., all of Baltimore, Md., in re bonus legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3480. Also, petition of Mrs. Mary Buchanan Redwood, Baltimore, Md., in re Army bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3481. Also, petition of Miss Mary B. Stewart, secretary Children's Playground Association of Baltimore, and Dr. Francis C. Nicholas, in re Smith of Idaho bill (H. R. 12446); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

3482. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of American Newspaper Publishers' Association, of New York, advocating certain legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3483. Also, petition of T. C. Atkeson, Gray Silver, and Charles A. Lyman, in connection with the Capper-Hersman bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3484. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of American Newspaper Publishers' Association, of New York, advocating adoption of certain legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3485. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Bureau of Disabled Men's Service and Legislative Relief, regarding soldiers' bonus legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3486. By Mr. WELTY: Petition favoring the passage of bill (H. R. 1112) providing for the parole of Federal prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, May 7, 1920.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, by Thy grace alone can we achieve that greatness which is worthy of us as a Nation. Thou hast given to us marvelous resources, Thou hast instructed us through a wonderful history, and Thou dost inspire us with great ideals for the future. We turn to Thee that we may learn the way of life, and having learned the lesson from communion with the Father, that our spirits may go forward with the assurance that Thou hast a place for us worthy of the greatest nation in the earth. Help us to perform our duties as in Thy sight. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2890) to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SNYDER, Mr. ELSTON, Mr. RHODES, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HAYDEN managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that Mr. SINCLAIR and Mr. GANDY were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 400) authorizing the Sioux Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims in the place of Mr. ELSTON and Mr. CARTER, respectively.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11960) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1921, insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill, asks a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. FLOOD managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 2528. An act to grant certain lands to the city of Pocatello, State of Idaho, for conserving and protecting the source of its water supply;

S. 3016. An act to authorize the disposition of certain grazing lands in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 302. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Provincetown and Plymouth, Mass.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CURTIS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Lucas, Kans., remonstrating against compulsory military training, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 1622, Patrons of Husbandry, of Topeka, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of a daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Tampa, Kans., remonstrating against the establishment of a department of education, which was ordered to lie on the table.